

Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht

Formerly Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik

Official Organ of the German Section of the Modern Language
Association of the Central West and South

VOL. XXX

January, 1938

NO. 1

GOETHE AND SCHILLER STAGE WALLENSTEIN

A. E. ZUCKER, Indiana University

Goethe's interest in the staging of plays began as a boy with his puppet-shows; as a student in Leipzig he took considerable part in amateur dramatics; as a young man in Weimar he acted numerous roles in the court theatricals, the most ambitious one that of Orestes in his own drama *Iphigenia*.

Of epochal importance for the development of the German stage is the fact that at the age of twenty-eight in the year 1777 he began to write a novel entitled *Wilhelm Meister's Theatrical Mission*. The chief character in this novel — named Wilhelm in allusion to Shakespeare — is, like all of Goethe's heroes, very much imbued with the author's own personality; this book forms part of the great confession which Goethe said all his works constituted, without of course being in any sense literally autobiographical. *Wilhelm Meister's* mission, as explained in chapter 18, is to be "that in happy moments he should behold in fancy the budding perfect actor, the creator of a great national theatre for which he had heard so many sigh, and never without a certain complaisant reflection upon himself."

Wilhelm sets out to direct the repertoire of the German stage into new channels, especially to introduce Shakespeare; to prepare adaptations of other great dramas of poetic content; to raise the intellectual level of the actor by training him carefully and inducing him to penetrate profoundly into his role; to make of the rehearsals an essential part of the work of the theatre; and finally to pay especial attention to *ensemble* play. In short, he was to become the great dramaturgist and stage-manager whom the German theatre needed so badly at that time of wandering theatrical troupes.¹ In telling how *Wilhelm Meister* joins a troupe of actors and plans to stage *Hamlet* with himself in the title role (not completed in the extant text, but described in the *Lehrjahre*), Goethe reveals an intimate knowledge of the stage and high ideals of art through the words of *Wilhelm Meister* and of Serlo, the director of the troupe, the latter modeled largely on the Hamburg actor Schröder.

A remarkable opportunity to work out *Wilhelm Meister's* dream was more or less foisted on Goethe when Duke Karl August made him director of the newly founded court theatre in Weimar in January, 1791. The task seemed a most unpromising one indeed to build up in provincial, poverty-stricken Weimar with its 6500 inhabitants (1790) a theatre of any artistic

¹Max Herrmann, *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*, Schriften der Gesellschaft für Theatergeschichte, Bd. 41, Berlin, 1930. — Quotation from *Wilhelm Meister's Theatrical Mission*, translated by Gregory A. Page, London, 1913, p. 41.

value.² Weimar had for the previous seven years had a theatrical troupe, to a slight extent subsidized by the court, but these actors under the direction of Joseph Bellomo, had only caused the judicious to grieve. Their repertoire consisted largely of noisy plays of medieval knighthood and lachrymose bourgeois family dramas. Correspondingly the acting was conceived in the spirit of everyday realism, not avoiding crass theatrical effects; there was very little art—simple, primitive feelings were expressed with great truthfulness in prosaic, popular diction. Goethe complained that German actors, as a rule, suffered from "rhythmophobia."³ Respect for the work of the dramatist was totally unknown, the actors changed and violated the text to their heart's content. Goethe misses among all but few actors "word for word memorizing, measured recitation, restrained action." Few stages insisted on careful rehearsals, even fewer on consistent ensemble play. Goethe was repelled by the easy-going philistinism of the German stage.

That Goethe's practical interest at first was but lukewarm is shown by the fact that a "regisseur" was engaged in the person of Franz Joseph Fischer from Prague and that the latter's name appeared on the program as the one responsible for the production. No great changes were initiated in the repertoire or the acting; a number of the actors of Bellomo's troupe were retained and a few new ones added. On the whole Goethe's share in the work was almost wholly administrative; he appeared rarely at the rehearsals. Beginning with March, 1793, however, Goethe began to devote himself much more to the theatre, selecting the "artistic" side of the management, while the "economic" was entrusted to Franz Kirms, one of the duke's ablest officials. A new set of rules for the conduct of the theatre was promulgated, and promising new actors were engaged while some of the less efficient ones were dropped. Goethe made a definite effort to achieve more artistic acting. In line with this endeavor the star of the Mannheim Theatre, August Wilhelm Iffland, who had won his first fame as Franz Moore in Schiller's *Die Räuber* in 1782 appeared for a short engagement on the Weimar stage in April, 1796. Iffland presented a number of his own plays, and appeared also in Schiller's *Die Räuber* and Goethe's *Egmont* in a much modified stage version prepared by Schiller. The appearance of the famous actor made a great impression on Goethe's theoretical ideas and served as an inspiration to the Weimar troupe. Goethe dates a third period of his directorship from this time up to the autumn of 1798 in which the high points were: the first appearances of Demoiselle Jagemann, a second engagement of Iffland who now appeared much less of a contrast to the better-trained Weimar actors, the increased cooperation of Schiller who was then writing his *Wallenstein*, and the training of the actors in the presentation of dramas in verse. This last was a decided innovation for practically all

²Bruno Th. Satori-Neumann, *Die Frühzeit des Weimarischen Hoftheaters unter Goethes Leitung, (1791-1798)*, Schriften der Gesellschaft für Theatergeschichte, Bd. 31, Berlin 1922.

³Goethe, *Wilhelm Meisters theatalische Sendung*, *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, and essays collected in W. A. Bd. 40, under *Theater und Schauspielkunst*.

actors, including the two greatest tragedians of the day, Schröder and Iffland, were opposed to verse on the stage.*

Goethe, as chief of the board of directors of the Court Theatre, was absolute ruler; in fact, it was to this that he attributed his success in speaking of it to Eckermann years afterward (March 22, 1825). Characteristic of his idealism is another remark to Eckermann also in retrospect:

I did not receive a penny for my work as director, I even spent a lot of money in feeding the actors and enjoyed the privilege of a sovereign to be generous to my heart's content. Yes, we date from an old and different time and we need not be ashamed of it.

The duties of the board consisted broadly of the following:

- 1) Care of the theatre building and the properties.
- 2) Selection of the staff, especially trying out and engaging actors, as well as securing famous artists for guest performances.
- 3) Preparing the season's program; choosing new dramas to be included in the repertoire.
- 4) In addition to the winter season in Weimar, arranging for the summer season at the resort Lauchstedt and other places. The summer season, generally on a lower artistic level, proved a profitable income that helped defray the cost of the Weimar productions and served to hold the company together.

On the subject of this time-consuming labor Goethe said to Eckermann, May 2, 1824:

Of course, during that time I might have written many dramas, but when I come to think of it, I do not regret it. I have always looked upon my work and accomplishments as symbolical, and at bottom it seemed immaterial to me whether I made pots or pans.

A subordinate office in the theatre was that of stage-manager (regisseur). At first one man, the above-mentioned Fischer, was selected for this task; but later it was divided among two or three of the older actors who each took their turn weekly and received extra pay for their labors. They did not consider the job an agreeable one, because their duty was to see that the actors appeared on time and that everything needed for the performance was in order. To a large extent they functioned as buffers between the board and the artistic temperament of the actors.⁵

Among the actors of the late 18th century cliques, cabals, and scandals were the order of the day. There was ample cause why so-called good society should scorn them, for among theatrical folk, especially among the majority who played in wandering troupes, adultery, divorce, "theatrical marriages," and love affairs with officers or students were exceedingly frequent. They notoriously left their debts unpaid and broke their contracts after the manager had paid them an advance. There were still even some cities, though this was becoming increasingly rare, where "comedians" did not enjoy full citizenship and were discriminated against in the law courts.

*Satori-Neumann, op. cit. pp. 165-167.

⁵Satori-Neumann, op. cit. pp. 160-175.

In general the clergy were violent in their denunciation of actors and the theatre. A burgher's son was frequently disinherited if he went on the stage and a member of the nobility was expected, if he became an actor, to suppress his name lest his class be disgraced. More frequently the actors were recruited, aside from members of actor's families, from among rusticated students or those unable to finish their courses. In *Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre* (Book I. Ch. 15) Goethe gives a vivid description of the intellectual level of the actors, naturally a disillusionment to our hero:

Ever busied in being idle, they seemed to think least of all on their employment and object; the poetic worth of a piece they were never heard to speak of, or to judge of, right or wrong; their continual question was simply: How much will it bring? Is it a stock-piece? How long will it run? How often think you it may be played? and other enquiries and observations of the same description. Then commonly they broke out against the manager, that he was stinted with his salaries, and especially unjust to this one or to that; then against the public, how seldom it recompensed the right man with its approval, how the German theatre was daily improving, how the player was ever growing more honored, and never could be honored enough. Then they would descant largely about wine-gardens and coffee-houses; how much debt one of their comrades had contracted, and must suffer a deduction from his wages on account of; about the disproportion of their weekly salaries; about the cabals of some rival company: on which occasion they would pass again to the great and merited attention which the public now bestowed upon them; not forgetting the importance of the theatre to the improvement of the nation and the world. (Carlyle's translation)

Of course, at court theatres or with other regular companies social conditions tended to improve. Goethe himself made every effort to raise the social standing of the actors by associating with them, and through his good example influenced many others in Weimar to do likewise. Goethe frequently invited them to his house for meals, in part to aid in raising their social position and also to arouse in the actors greater artistic interest in their work.

The number of actors in Weimar was about as great as on other repertoire stages, 20 to 25, a few more men than women, and a number of acting children. The pay was also in keeping with the standard set at other theatres, except that it was a little lower than in Berlin. Goethe was opposed to engaging actors to play only definite, specified parts; all actors, when not otherwise engaged, were required to do duty as supernumeraries. Thus Graff, famed for his portrayal of Wallenstein, danced as a slave in *The Magic Flute*, Vohs, another tragedian, appeared in a comedy made up as a ridiculous tailor, and the other actors did not consider such parts beneath their dignity, but undertook them gladly in the interest of their theatre.⁶ In a conversation with Eckermann of February 26, 1824, Goethe told with some amusement that the actor Becker had refused to take the part of a soldier in *Wallenstein*, until Goethe threatened that he would

⁶Goethes Schauspieler und Musiker, Erinnerungen von Eberwein und Lobe. Hrsg. von Dr. W. Bode, Berlin, 1912, p. 53.

then play the part himself. "That helped. For they knew me at the theatre and realized that such things were no joking matter with me, and that I was crazy enough to keep my word and do the maddest things." "Would you really have played the role?" asked Eckermann. "Yes," said Goethe, "I would have played it and would have outdone Mr. Becker, for I knew the part better than he."

In case of illness no deduction from pay was made in Weimar. But for disciplinary purposes there were fines, yes, even military arrest for the actors and for actresses confinement in their living quarters while a sentinel was posted before their door. In case actors failed to pay their debts the amounts could be subtracted from their wages. Before members of the company married they were expected to report the matter to the Board. In case of pregnancy unmarried actresses were required to leave the company; however, the public did not object to seeing pregnant married actresses on the stage.⁷ Characteristic for the tolerance of the public in the 18th century it would seem to be that in *Wilhelm Meister's Theatrical Mission* (Book V, Chapter VI) we read: "Madame Melina, in spite of her advanced pregnancy, was resolved to undertake the part of the Celestial Virgin." Julius Wahle sums up Goethe's relation to his actors by saying that though a certain beaurocratic sternness was present, yet, despite his autocracy and formality, a genuine human tendency came to the fore at all times.⁸

Above all Goethe trained his actors by his own great enthusiasm for the art of the theatre. He said to Eckermann March 22, 1825, regarding his activity as stage-manager:

I was in constant personal contact with the actors. I conducted readings and explained his role to each individual; I was present at the rehearsals and talked over with them how things might be improved; I never failed to attend the performances and remarked the next day on whatever did not appear to me to have been well done. In this manner I advanced the actors in their art.

That Goethe was a person to inspire the imagination of the actors is a well attested fact as the following quotations show:

Goethe had a beautiful voice. He knew well how to let this voice rise from the tenderest emotion to a sound of thunder, when he was in a gentle mood, in anger, or in passionate excitement. — His presentation was "not really artistic," since he took too passionate an interest in the subject matter and "acted" rather than "read." But it was an incomparable delight to hear him and to see him. — His reading had a great variety of expression, power, fire, clearness, and plasticity. Each beautiful passage made a vivid impression on his mind: he explained it, read it two or three times, and said a thousand things in connection with it that were still more beautiful. He visualized everything vividly, and with each scene he saw in his mind's eye the entire stage setting. When he read he seemed to be in an ecstatic condition, his eyes flushed with enthusiasm, his face beamed, and his entire being was deeply moved. In tragic parts he at times failed to strike the proper note by lapsing

⁷Satori-Neumann, pp. 176-190.

⁸Wahle, Julius, *Das Weimarer Hoftheater unter Goethes Leitung. Schriften der Goethe Gesellschaft*, Bd. 7, 1892, p. 195.

into pathos, but in comedy he was in full control of himself, here he was incomparable.

These quotations I have taken from Satori-Neumann and in the following detailed description of a rehearsal under Goethe's direction I follow the same author who quotes contemporary sources verbatim:

So long as Goethe was not yet in the theatre, things proceeded in a lively fashion on the stage; the arrival, the coming and going of the actors and others busy about the theatre, the preliminary arrangements which the stage-manager (Genast) called for, in order to make everything ready, brought movement and life into the staff. . . . Shortly before Goethe's arrival Genast had taken good care that the stage be cleared and everything ready for the first act. You should have seen the zeal and care with which this vivacious man carried out this business and the punctuality with which his orders were obeyed. . . . Goethe never came late to the rehearsals. . . . On the dot of the appointed hour he drove up before the theatre. . . . How pleased everyone was when he entered and answered in his friendly manner the respectful greeting of his subordinates. . . . At the rehearsals and the performances Goethe took his seat in the first row of the reserved parterre (i. e. in the middle of the auditorium). . . . On his appearance a sudden silence prevailed and everyone went to his post. The stage-manager approached the chief with the question, "Does your Excellency command that we begin?" Upon Goethe's sonorous "If you please!" things immediately got under way and proceeded with various shorter or longer interruptions. . . . Goethe's presence had as stimulating an effect on his disciples as though they faced a crowded auditorium. Seriously and solemnly each carried out his assigned task. . . . Goethe had his eye on everything, even insignificant matters which some directors do not see or do not care to notice. . . . How attentively everyone listened when from the depth of the auditorium he spoke, excelling the voice of the most gifted actor in force, range and sonorosity. . . . He overlooked nothing in the work of any actor or actress; at times he remarked that a certain passage had been spoken too quickly or too slowly, that an actor approached too closely or not near enough to his interlocutor, that an actor's exit was made too hastily or not rapidly enough—and everyone understood that, without any argument, everything that he criticised had to be done in the manner he directed it should be done. . . . And what consideration he showed when he gave his orders! Never did he express his dissatisfaction in harsh words; his criticism, especially when directed toward the older actors, was such that it could not offend them, for example, "Well, that isn't bad, but I had imagined this point as follows; let us think it over till the next rehearsal and perhaps then our views will be in accord." Toward the younger actors he was a bit less considerate; there he said, "You should do it thus, so that the point of this speech will not be lost." . . . Very rarely did Goethe lose his classic calm.

Especially with young actors or actresses who showed real talent Goethe worked with infinite patience; an anecdote is told of how Goethe had the subsequently very distinguished actress Amalie Wolff repeat her first small part fifty times until she was reduced to tears and then ordered her to try again the next day in a similar individual rehearsal. Naturally enough careless actors or those with artistic temperament hated and reviled Goethe's methods. But I shall quote a passage from *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* that

shows how seriously Goethe took the art of the theatre and the perfection of the passing moment on the stage. Philina says that there is no point in preparing a performance carefully, because like a hundred others it will soon be forgotten:

The guests you entertain have always something to object against the dinner; nay, if you could hear them talk of it at home, they cannot understand how it was possible to undergo so sad a business.

Let me turn your illustration, pretty one, to my own advantage, answered Wilhelm. Consider how much must be done by art and nature, by traffickers and tradesmen, before an entertainment can be given. How many years the stag must wander in the forest, the fish in the river or the sea, before they can deserve to grace our table! And what cares and consultations with her cooks and servants has the lady of the house submitted to! Observe with what indifference the people swallow the production of the distant vintager, the seaman and the vintner, as if it were a thing of course. And ought these men to cease from laboring, providing and preparing; ought the master of the house to cease from purchasing and laying up the fruits of their exertions, because at last the enjoyment it affords is transitory? But no enjoyment can be transitory; the impression which it leaves is permanent; and what is done with diligence and effort communicates to the spectator a hidden force, of which we cannot say how far its influence may reach.⁹

Goethe set down the quintessence of his experience with the stage in 91 rules for actors. They range all the way from precepts regarding correct speech, pronunciation, modulation, declamation, recitation of rhythmic lines, position and movement of the body, of the hands, and of the arms, to rules concerning rehearsals, bad habits to be avoided, and the grouping of actors on the stage. The fundamental idea is typical of the mature Goethe: the actor is not only to imitate nature but also to idealize it, what is required is not only truth but above all beauty. This latter Goethe finds in Greek sculpture and he demands gestures, poses, and groupings that are fundamentally statuesque. He even goes so far as to advise the actors to cultivate beautiful poses in every day life, while out walking or at table. For the most part these rules are extremely practical and especially his "don'ts" betray a great deal of shrewd observation.¹⁰ All in all it was Goethe's intention to stress everything that would make of the drama a harmonious whole; everything in the acting, the scenery or the music was to contribute to the artistic unity of the piece.

Goethe had also established very definite house-rules for the actors and stage-hands. Tardiness at a rehearsal cost an actor 8 *Groschen*, at a performance a dollar; for improvising the fine was 10 *Groschen*. The performances usually began at six, after the orchestra had first rendered a symphony or some other musical number, and all actors were required to be in their dressing rooms half an hour in advance. The prompter was to be on hand to do everything in the interest of a good performance; he was to speak clearly, but in such a manner that the spectators should not be aware of it.

⁹Carlyle's translation, Vol. I, p. 310 ff. The preceding pages are based on Satorius-Neumann, pp. 264-282.

¹⁰Goethes Werke, W. A. Bd. 40, pp. 134-168.

The performance was to proceed in exactly the manner prescribed at the dress rehearsal. The stage-manager watched over the performance by means of a carefully prepared scenario; if he had to appear on the stage he turned this over to another actor not busy at the moment. Curtain calls for actors were the custom on some stages, but they were forbidden in Weimar. The announcement of the play for the next performance was not printed on the program, but was made at the end of the performance by the manager or a favorite actor who stepped before the curtain for this purpose. At times this was done humorously or in verse while the very much interested audience applauded or expressed an eager desire for some particular piece.¹¹

The theatre building of Weimar was exceedingly modest and unpretentious. Erected in 1779 as *Redoutensaal* (hall for court balls) it was designed not primarily as a theatre. It was a simple rectangular building, roughly 160 by 50 feet, two stories high with a sharply slanting roof; the main entrance in the center of the long side had a Greek portico with four columns, but there was nothing to mark it especially as a theatre. To one of the chroniclers of the Weimar stage, W. G. Gotthardi, who saw it in 1813 as a seven-year-old boy it was at first sight a disappointment, for it seemed no more impressive than the parsonage of his native village.¹² Naturally after seven years of labor as director Goethe saw many possibilities for improvement and in 1798 he seized upon the presence in Weimar of the Stuttgart architect Thouret to urge that the interior be rebuilt with the purpose of making it a better theatre.¹³

Goethe himself had a hand in planning the alterations and throughout the summer he visited the scene of the building operations almost every day. These were concerned chiefly with fundamental changes in the auditorium. The Weimar theatre consisted of three almost equal parts, each approximately a square: the stage was at one end, the auditorium in the centre, while the other third was given up to a promenade and stairways leading up to the balcony and gallery. Goethe¹⁴ describes the total effect of the renovated auditorium as being in good taste, serious, without at the same time appearing oppressive or over-ornamented. A semi-circle of pilasters, painted to represent granite, supported a balcony running from one end of the proscenium arch to the other. The duke's box occupied the center of the balcony directly opposite the stage, while on the right were rows of seats for the nobility and on the left boxes. Eighteen Doric columns, painted to represent antique yellow marble with bronzed capitals, supported the gallery. Above each of the columns were theatrical masks of different types running all the way from comical caricature to tragic repose, providing, as Goethe suggests, during the intermissions ample material for the thoughtful spec-

¹¹Satori-Neumann, pp. 279-282.

¹²W. S. Gotthardi, *Weimarsche Theaterbilder aus Goethes Zeit*, Jena und Leipzig, 1865. Vol. I, p. 25 ff. His disappointment did not include the interior; that seemed to transport him to the fairy-land of the Arabian Nights.

¹³Weichberger, Alexander, *Goethe und das Komödienhaus in Weimar, 1779-1825*, pp. 25-62.

¹⁴Goethes Werke, W. A. Bd. 40, pp. 3-8.

tator's musings. The ground floor consisted of the parquet, the seats immediately behind the orchestra, and the parterre. At the rear of the parterre below the ducal box were two boxes, one of them later taken over by Goethe.

The range of prices ran from 12 *Groschen* (about 30 cents) for seats in the parquet and balcony, to 8 for the parterre, and 3 for the gallery; season tickets were sold at considerable reduction and the regular subscribers were entitled also to admission to the balls. The performances took place as a rule on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Saturdays.¹³

An ornament for the auditorium was the grand chandelier which consisted of two circles containing 24 tallow lamps hung about with many decorative bits of cut glass that reflected the lights from their many facets. During the performance it was drawn up into a sort of cupola in order to darken the auditorium. Besides this central one there were four smaller chandeliers and 18 wall lamps of polished brass. The stage too was illuminated by two chandeliers which remained in place during all changes of scenery, while 64 tallow candles from the wings and 24 footlights could be lowered out of sight. Lighting effects were obtained by moving frames with colored oil paper before the lights in the wings.

The dimensions of the stage too strike us as exceedingly small, especially in view of the great dramas staged there. Its opening measured about 23 feet (whereas average-sized theatres today have a proscenium arch about twice as large) and its depth was about 29 feet. At the rear of the stage were two dressing rooms, one for men and one for women, and between the two a corridor about 20 feet wide. The latter could be used as a sort of rear stage and was so employed by Schiller in *Wallenstein* when in his stage directions (Act V, Scene 5) he had the hero disappear for his final exit down a long corridor.¹⁴ The windows at the sides of the stage made it possible to hold the rehearsals by daylight. At the front of the stage were proscenium doors, and behind these five wings, of which generally only three were used. Two drops were at the back of the stage; like most theatres of that day the Weimar stage had no loft, hence the scenery could not be raised or lowered vertically, but had to be wound up on rollers, which involved a great deal of wear and tear. The scenery was fastened on the stage floor with battons and stage screws.

The theatre possessed considerable scenery, a forest, a palace room, a yellow room, a red room, a farm, a street, a garden, as well as a few more sets; an astrological room was provided new for the performance of *Wallenstein*. Still, the Weimar theatre-goers in the course of a season probably became very well acquainted with the scenery of their stock company. The same was true of the properties; on special occasions furniture was borrowed from the ducal palace.¹⁵

For the opening of the renovated theatre Goethe selected Schiller's *Wal-*

¹³Julius Petersen, *Schiller und die Bühne*, Berlin, 1904.

¹⁴Satori-Neumann, pp. 145-152.

lenstein's Camp and thus initiated the series of performances that made the little Weimar stage "the centre of the world for matters of dramatic art" (Calvin Thomas). In order to give an adequate conception of his hero, the greatest figure in German tragedy, Schiller found it necessary to use ten acts and a dramatic overture; the latter, one scene redolent with the spirit of the Thirty Years' War as revealed in the camp of Wallenstein's army, was performed October 12, 1798, and the other two parts, the *Piccolomini* and *Wallenstein's Death*, were presented later at three month intervals. Throughout the preceding summer Goethe and Schiller exchanged ideas on this performance in letters or in long talks when Goethe visited his friend at Jena. They collaborated in their search for illustrative material in order to give to the *mores*, the language and the costumes of the drama the historical spirit and true local color. For the sermon of the camp revivalist Goethe sent Schiller a volume of sermons by Abraham a Sancta Clara, a 17th century Billy Sunday, and composed the Soldiers' song with which the play opens: Schiller added a few stanzas because he wished to have a little more time for the movements of the supernumeraries just after the curtain had risen. Likewise Goethe inserted a few lines into the prologue written by Schiller for this performance, the chief import of which was a fine tribute to the Weimar actors. Indeed, as one reads the letters, sometimes several in one day, that were exchanged between Weimar and Jena one cannot help becoming infected with the intense excitement that preceded the great dramatic event. And one can understand, too, how in 1825 on the day after the theatre had been burned to the ground the 76-year old Goethe spoke to Eckermann with restrained emotion of the time "when Schiller's plays were written here year by year and, under his own direction, were performed at the Weimar theatre in their pristine glory." "I shall not deny it," said Goethe, "that was something!"

Shortly after the première Goethe wrote a description of the performance of *Wallenstein's Camp*. He tells that Schiller's prologue was delivered by the actor Vohs, dressed as Max Piccolomini, the role he was to play in the other parts of the drama; Goethe seemed very pleased with the manner in which he spoke the iambic pentameter since this augured well for the future performances of poetic drama. There was no longer any "rhythmophobia" on the Weimar stage.

After the prologue the orchestra struck up a military march and before the curtain rose a stirring soldiers' song was heard. The stage then revealed the gay bustle of the camp: tents, soldiers in various kinds of uniforms, booths, a kettle over a campfire, boys rolling dice on a drum — and all the while the ribald song continued inside a tent, expressing the mood of these mercenaries. A peasant appeared with his son, determined by means of loaded dice to revenge himself on the soldiers for their pillaging; Goethe notes that Herr Beck spoke these lines with the clearness and accuracy that is required on the part of the actor who is entrusted with the exposition, while at the same time his acting bespoke droll peasant cunning. Gradually the spirit of Wallenstein's army was graphically revealed by means of the

differences in the soldiers of the various regiments, the relation of the army to the oppressed peasant, to the mulcted burgher, to a coarse religion, to their revered general and to a more remote emperor. The war has already raged for sixteen years, unprincipled soldiers have fought first on one side then on the other, and Germany has been ravaged by endless battles, marches and sieges. The play is written in short rimed lines that lend themselves aptly to the gay, impertinent humor with which it is filled.

The conflict later to be developed in the drama is touched upon also. There is a rumor to the effect that the emperor wishes to send a part of the army to the Netherlands, for the purpose, as the soldiers suspect, of weakening Wallenstein. The men however love their leader and prefer to fight and die under him. On the other hand, the sermon of the Capuchin monk with all its comical invective reveals that there is an anti-Wallenstein movement also; the preacher would not dare make his insinuations if he had not had backers somewhere. The soldiers threaten to hang the monk and after the latter has fled they resolve, with no disloyalty to the emperor, to protest against the plan of dividing the army. With this exposition of the theme of the drama *Wallenstein's Camp* comes to an end. The curtain was lowered as the bold, bad soldiers in a colorful semi-circle once more roared the soldier's song, as Goethe described it, exhilarating even to the most peaceful spectator.¹⁷

After the performance the participants met for a banquet at "The Elephant." There was every reason for celebrating this memorable event and as the festive gayety rose higher and higher Schiller leaped on the table and delivered to the enjoyment of the actors the vituperative sermon of the Capuchin monk in his Suabian accent that the poet's friends found so quaintly amusing.¹⁸ Schiller, just like Goethe, believed in cordial association with the actors. On such occasions they rejoiced over their successes and discussed matters that might be improved at the next performance.

From among these actors comes one of the finest tributes ever paid a literary man, especially remarkable because the writer is Karoline Jagemann, the very actress whose intrigues caused Goethe with a heavy heart to give his resignation as director of the theatre in 1817. She writes in her memoirs, not without a certain amount of venom:

Never did Goethe's beautiful humanity stand out more brilliantly than in his relation to his only rival. . . . What he gradually began to realize at the performance of *Wallenstein* became much clearer to him with each succeeding Schiller play, namely that his friend was by far the superior dramatist, and he could not fail to be touched in his pride when in contrast to the enthusiastic reception of Schiller's dramas his own scored but *succes d'estime*. What he did under the circumstances could have been done by only a really great man: he placed himself in the second position, and turned over to the better man not only the disposition of the theatre but also the artistic direction — a moral grandeur

¹⁷ *Eröffnung des Weimarischen Theaters*, Goethes Werke, W. A. Bd. 40, pp. 9-34.

¹⁸ Alexander von Gleichen-Russwurm, *Schiller, die Geschichte seines Lebens*, Stuttgart, 1913, p. 472.

that counts for more than his best dramas. And therefore, when one speaks of our great German tragedian one ought always to mention the name of his friend.¹⁹

It is truly a fitting touch that the sculptor Rietschel in the Goethe-Schiller monument before the Weimar theatre has represented the two men each clasping the other's right hand.

Through the cooperation of these two great poets, unexampled in all world literature, the Weimar stage produced not only Schiller's other great works until his death in 1805, but also classical plays from Greek, Elizabethan, Spanish and French drama. The fine repertoire dreamed by Wilhelm Meister became reality, as well as the other ideals of his *Theatrical Mission*, in a rare opportunity offered an author to translate his utopia into reality. Goethe's novel made the German people conscious of the fact that the work of the despised "comedian" could be a great art, and the enormous amount of time he and Schiller devoted to the ephemeral art of the actor is another reason why the Germans take their theatre so seriously.

What Goethe taught his actors has come to be called the Weimar style — it is characterized by rhythmic speech, restraint in emotion and gesture, and statuesque poses and groupings. For Goethe's and Schiller's plays it was the "natural" manner of presentation.²⁰ While a great deal of beauty was achieved by it the Weimar style has its limitations; especially when employed by uninspired directors or actors it is likely to degenerate into chill declamation and routine gestures for the expression of each emotion. Hence it is not surprising that in the later nineteenth century, especially with the rise of realistic drama in prose, the Weimar style fell into disrepute; yet it remains true even today that when poetic drama is to be presented beautifully the actor must return to rhythm and restraint, much as Goethe taught it at Weimar.

Even Goethe's resignation is one more act on his part in the direction of bettering the theatre. It came about when the actress Karoline Jagemann, the mistress of Duke Karl August, prevailed on the latter to order the performance, on April 12, 1817, of *The Dog of Aubry de Mont-Didier*, a play in which the chief role is played by a trained dog. Some fifty years before this time there would probably not have been anyone to take offense at a dog's appearance on the German stage, such as it was, but after Goethe's genius had been dedicated to it for a quarter of a century and Schiller's plays had there seen their premières this was indeed a sacrilege for the Weimar stage. And Goethe's resignation in protest has helped in affirming the position of the theatre as the temple of the highest form of art in the literatures of the world.

¹⁹Die Erinnerungen der Karoline Jagemann, Dresden, 1926, p. 288.

²⁰Gothardt, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 65.

GEIBEL UND MÖRIKE

Mit bisher unveröffentlichten Briefen Mörikes an Geibel, mitgeteilt von
FRITZ RICHTER, Oak Park Junior College, Oak Park, Ill.

Im Jahre 1855 sandte Mörike zwei Bände seiner Dichtungen, wohl auf Anraten Heyses, mit dem er durch Storms Vermittlung seit 1850 in kurzem Briefwechsel stand, an Maximilian II., den großen Förderer Geibels, Heyses und anderer. Der König war schon vor Erhalt dieser Dichtergabe auf den Stuttgarter Lyriker aufmerksam gemacht worden, und sein Bestreben war es, diesen für seine Tafelrunde Schönheitskult treibender Poeten zu gewinnen, um als ein echter Nacheiferer Carl Augusts in München ein zweites Weimar erstehen zu lassen. Der König schrieb zunächst einen anerkennenden Brief nach Stuttgart: „Inmitten so mancher von Leidenschaft bewegten literarischen Schöpfungen der Zeit ist ein Dichter, der, wie Sie die Anmut liebt, und das heilige Maß, eine wohltuende Erscheinung.“ Bald darauf erwählte er einen Vermittler, der Mörike aufsuchen sollte, um den Ortswechsel zu besprechen. Dieser Mittelsmann war natürlich niemand anders als Emanuel Geibel, des Königs glänzendster Stern, der, mit wahren Führergaben ausgestattet, immer wieder versuchte, die stillen und wesensverwandten Talente nach München zu ziehen. Im Jahre 1855 suchte Geibel Eduard Mörike auf, ungefähr zu derselben Zeit, in der er sich um den vereinsamten Otto Ludwig bemühte, der damals in Dresden ein in fast jeder Weise sorgenvolles Dasein führte. Beide Dichter unternahmen einen Spaziergang nach Cannstatt, und Geibel hielt diese Stunde in der freien Natur, mit dem mit „Schäflewolken“ bedeckten Himmel, für die Unterredung günstig. Er trug sie Mörike vor, aber dieser gab die für seine statische Art wunderbar bezeichnende Antwort: „Sie dürfen mir's glauben, daß ich dankbarst die freundliche Absicht, welche Sie leitet, empfinde. Aber es geht nicht. Wenn Sie wüsten, welchen Entschluß schon es mich kostet, einer Gesellschaft zu lieb in einen anderen Rock zu schlüpfen.“

Der Besuch hatte also nicht den gewünschten Erfolg, aber er war für beide, die in ihrer ruhigen und vornehmen Art wesensverwandt waren, von nicht vorübergehender Bedeutung. Sie sind in jenen Stunden Freunde geworden, was Mörike im nachstehenden Brief an Geibel, der eine Antwort auf die Nachricht von Adas Tod ist, herzlich betont:

Mit großer Überraschung und innigem Leidwesen, verehrtester Freund, habe ich Ihre Botschaft empfangen. Von Ihrer lieben Frau lag mir das Bild einer zwar leidenden, aber keineswegs bedenklichen Kranken, im Ganzen eine heitere Vorstellung, im Sinn, und noch drei Tage vor der Ankunft Ihres Briefes sprach ich in dieser Voraussetzung von Ihrem glücklichen Zusammenleben. Ich kann mir nun wohl denken, wie es jetzt um Sie steht. Gewiß zwar haben Sie, nach Allem was ich mittelbar von Ihrem inneren Leben weiß und schließe, vor tausend Andern, die in solchem Falle sind, den Trost der Überzeugung voraus, daß das, was wir beweinen, in einer neuen Wirklichkeit fortlebe (für mich ist dieses eine ausgemachte natürliche Sache und ist bei mir eben so wenig bloßer Glaube als bloßes Resultat des Resonements), allein der Schmerz des Entbehrens wird um wenig geringer dadurch. Was Sie

sonst trösten muß und wird, brauch ich nicht auszuführen; nur so viel muß ich sagen daß, wenn die Achtung der Welt, der Genuss eines werdenden Ruhmes, und wenn die Liebe brüderlicher Freunde Sie erhebt und stärkt, ich nicht der letzte unter denen zu sein wünsche, an welche Sie jetzt manchen Winterabend in Ihrem stillen Zimmer denken.

Mit dem Meister Andrea haben wir alle uns herzlich ergötzt. Ich zweifle auch garnicht daß, gut gespielt oder vorgelesen, er überall das seyn und leisten werde wofür Sie ihn gaben. Ein Anderer hätte vielleicht eine harte psychologische Nuß daraus gemacht, ein verstecktes tragisches Motiv daraus entwickelt und wäre an dieser Klippe verunglückt.

Die beiliegenden Büchlein waren für die beiden Frauen meiner neuen Münchener Freunde bestimmt. Behalten Sie also das eine, das andere übergeben Sie mit meinen besten Grüßen. Ich bitte, daß Sie beiderseits mir nicht auf dies antworten und danken, da ich ja Ihrer freundlichen Aufnahme ganz versichert seyn darf.

Stuttgart d. 14. Dez. 1855. Ihr E. Mörike.

Daß Geibel mit der Trauerbotschaft sein einige Monate vor Adas Tod vollendetes Stück „Meister Andrea“ an Mörike gesandt hatte, beweist seine Sympathie für den Stuttgarter Dichter, die trotz des mißglückten Versuches, ihn nach München zu locken, nicht gelitten hatte. Geibel muß nach der Rückkehr nach München dem Könige äußerst günstig berichtet und sein Urteil über Mörike, daß er „unter den lebenden Lyrikern Deutschlands eine der ersten Stellen, wo nicht die erste einnimmt“ im vollen Maße aufrecht erhalten haben, denn bald konnte Geibel seinem neuen Freund berichten, daß ihn Maximilian zum Ritter bayrischer Orden ernennen wolle. Mörike antwortet am 28. Januar 1856:

In größter Eile, mein verehrter Freund, hierbei die beiden Bändchen, deren eines ich zu meinem Verdrüß nicht eher aus den Händen des Buchbinders habe erhalten können. Die Güte Ihres Königs hat mich wahrlich gerührt, und wie viel Dank bin ich Ihnen schuldig. Was ich in bester Meinung dumm angriff (indem Ihre Person fürs erste ganz unbemengt mit der Sache seyn sollte) war nur auf diesem Wege wieder gut zu machen.

Darf ich Sie bitten, die anderen Beilagen Herrn Bodenstedt bei Gelegenheit zu übergeben, auch Heyse schönstens zu grüßen. Ihr sehr ergebener Mörike. NS. Besonders danke ich noch für den guten Rath mit den Gedichten. Eine poetische Widmung aber wäre mir schwerlich gelungen.

Die Freundschaft zwischen Geibel und Mörike ist in den ferneren Jahren unverändert geblieben. Sie gleicht auffallend der Beziehung zwischen Geibel und Ludwig. In beiden Fällen ist der Münchener Dichter der aktive und helfenwollende Teil, der Freund, der Ratschläge erteilt und zur Weiterarbeit anstachelt. Selbst durch Nichtbeantwortung seiner Briefe läßt er sich lange nicht abschrecken. Immer wieder versucht er persönlichen Kontakt zu bekommen. Bei Durchreisen durch Stuttgart, hat er oft versucht, Mörike zu sprechen. So am 4. September 1855, als er zusammen mit Scherer ihn besuchen wollte. Mörike war nicht zu Hause und schreibt an beide, die ihn noch am gleichen Tage zu sprechen wünschten, folgende Nachricht:

Lieben Freunde

Ich kann heut leider, nicht abkommen. Es ist nicht nur die Frage wegen des Kindes, mit dem wir noch zur Stunde nicht wissen wohin,— es ist noch eine andere böse Familienaffaire in der ich gehetzt bin. Ich hoffe aber Geibel doch noch gewiß zu sehen u. werde Sie beide morgen nach Tisch aufsuchen. Von Herzen Ihr Mörike.

Geibel ist damals gerade sehr ungelegen gekommen, denn die Zerbröcklung der Ehe mit Margarethe von Speeth hatte in jenen Tagen schon — 17 Jahre vor der offiziellen Trennung — eingesetzt.

Nichts Schriftliches aus der freundschaftlichen Verbindung dieser beiden Dichter ist mehr auf uns gekommen. Es ist nicht Geibels Schuld. Er hat Mörike niemals aufgegeben. Wie er 1856 Otto Ludwig ein Jahresstipendium von 400 Talern vom bayrischen Könige verschafft hat und von vielen Zeitgenossen in seiner Ludwigsschätzung nicht verstanden wurde, hat er Mörike im Jahre 1862 ein noch schöneres Freundsgeschenk gebracht: Er setzte es durch, daß sein Stuttgarter Freund den Maximiliansorden bekam, den alle Kapitelmitglieder Bodenstedt zudenken wollten.

Aus einem veröffentlichten und an seine Schwester Klara gerichteten Brief wissen wir dann nur noch, daß Geibel 1867 auf einer Durchreise Mörike wiederum aufzusuchen wollte, ihn jedoch gleichfalls nicht antraf. Zum Zeichen seines Besuches schnitzte Geibel seine Initialen in eine der jungen Buchen vor dem Lorcher Haus. Noch über ein Jahr später berichtet dies Mörike seiner Schwester und erzählt jene lustige Begebenheit mit den preußischen und Geibellieder singenden Besuchern. (K. Fischer und R. Krauss, Mörikes Briefe, II.) Im Jahre 1868 ist dann Geibel entgültig nach Lübeck gezogen und diese Freundschaft scheint mit jener stummen aber tiefen Innigkeit, wie sie beiden Dichtern eigen war, abgeschlossen worden zu sein.

CORRECTION

The author of the article "Franz Kafka", (*Monatshefte*, December, 1937, Vol. XXIX, No. 8, pp. 373-388) is not Wolfgang Petersen, as listed, but Wolfgang Paulsen, University of Reading, England.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS A TEACHING AID

A. E. SOKOL, *Stanford University, California*

There are a number of possible purposes for which examinations can be devised and used. They can be conceived of as hurdles in the path of degree-seekers; they can be and often are used to prove irrefutably the student's ignorance; most usually they serve as a basis for grading and separating the white from the black sheep; they can also be designed as placement tests and for other special purposes. But we need not go into a further classification, nor into a survey of examinations in general or in particular, for the intention of this article is to add another examination to the long list of tests from which the modern teacher can choose. However, it is not really a new kind of test that is to be advocated, but rather a device that serves a somewhat different purpose from that for which most examinations are given, having as its aim not so much the checking of a student's knowledge as the provision of an aid in teaching and in making sure that he obtains the knowledge which the teacher considers to be essential.

The device in question consists simply of a list of questions, carefully prepared to cover the entire scope of the course and given to the student in place of the usual syllabus at the beginning of the term. Its advantage over the ordinary syllabus which presents the subject in outline form consists in the fact that the questionnaire, in addition to being a guide through the field that is to be covered, also offers the student definite suggestions as to what kind of questions might be asked, so that he can prepare himself accordingly. Its primary object should not be, however, to facilitate the student's work, but rather to improve its results. It should not be given to him to make it easier for him to pass the final examination, but to help him to acquire the knowledge out of which correct answers can be made.

This questionnaire, or list of questions, can be used as a store from which the questions for the end examination are to be drawn; however, in view of its chief purpose it would be more commendable to regard it as the basis for written reports which are to be handed to the teacher, in order to enable him to check the student's knowledge of the field, before the end of the term, that is, before it is too late to do anything about a possible lack of information or understanding.

If we are often disappointed with the results of our teaching as reflected by the outcome of the final examination, we may endeavor to do better in the future, but we usually can do little to remedy the situation for the time being, for our chance to do so has gone with our students. If we are told nowadays that there is little correlation between the evaluations of tests by different examiners, nor between these valuations and the student's achievements in later life, the answer does not seem to be to use only objective tests instead of subjective ones, but rather that the entire system of examinations as practiced today calls for a thorough reform. It may be that we have spent too much time and energy to find out what

the student does not know, instead of helping him to learn all that he should know.

But even if our questionnaire is to be used as the basis for the traditional end examination, it has certain definite advantages. To be sure, if the student knows in advance that some of the questions in his list are to be included in the final quiz, the element of surprise is eliminated. But instead of lowering the standard of work, this fact should definitely improve its quality. There should be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the questions, because there is ample time to find out before the great event, the final examination. If the student is given an opportunity to work out his answers ahead of time, he can clear up his mind on matters which were not adequately grasped in class, and he can gather further information before it is too late. Thus he will learn more, and besides, he will be able to present his answers in a better form, than if the questions are just "sprung" on him and he is expected to answer them off-hand. In addition to these important advantages, most of which are claimed for the report-system in general, some of the nervousness which has been blamed for many a failure will also be taken out of the final examination, because the student need not fear any surprises, and because he will feel that good preparation will be rewarded by a good grade more automatically than is the case with the traditional testing method. Another benefit will often be obtained, too: the student will be led to find answers to the questions in his list as the problems on which they are based are being discussed in class; he will not postpone work on them until the end of the term, and thus cramming during the last few days of the term will be minimized.

However, despite these improvements over the usual syllabus and the conventional examination, it is evident that the questionnaire cannot be used equally well for all purposes. It will scarcely come into consideration for advanced classes where the subject does not lend itself to being cut up into small portions, and where topics of a more comprehensive nature are to be treated in the examination in order to bring out the special and personal characteristics of each student in the class. Neither will it be possible to use it in beginners' classes, or reading and composition courses, whose work involves so many details that the teacher will hardly be able to draw up a comprehensive list of problems. Its chief field of usability will thus obviously be the survey course in the various fields of study.

Naturally, a primary requirement for a teaching aid of this kind is careful planning of the questions which must be framed so as to cover the entire subject under discussion and worded so as to allow only one definite answer. However, both questions on facts and details, as well as those requiring understanding and judgment in answering them, can be included, and there need not be any limit to the length or thoroughness of the replies.

If worked out well and applied with discrimination, a questionnaire of this kind may help student and teacher considerably to attain the object of their work. It will not, of course, prove to be a panacea for all the ills

inherent in teaching or studying, and it is not claimed to be the Philosopher's Stone that will automatically change poor teaching and poor studying into a successful and painless activity. But no quasi-mechanical device can do that, and with or without questionnaire, the personality of teacher and student will always remain the basic and determining factor of good work. But it can, and experience shows that it does, improve achievements in a very noticeable way, and therefore the attention of teachers is called here to this comparatively simple and, within limits, efficient teaching aid.

A few examples from questionnaires of this kind, actually used in classes, may follow this brief discussion. The first was designed for a survey course on "Deutsche Kulturgeschichte", the second for a course on "Deutsche Literaturgeschichte von 1600 bis 1800." Both classes met four times a week, for a quarter of three months. In both cases the effort to cover the ground as thoroughly as possible in a course of this type unintentionally resulted in the same number of questions, exactly 140, which means that an average of four questions or problems had to be discussed in each class period.

VII. Spätmittelalter (etwa 1250—1500).

51. Auf welchen Grundlagen baut sich die Macht der deutschen Könige und Kaiser seit Rudolf von Habsburg auf?
52. Wie wird die Königswahl durch die "Goldene Bulle" geregelt?
53. Woran scheitern die verschiedenen Versuche einer Reichsreform?
54. Welche sozialen Verschiebungen machen sich um diese Zeit bemerkbar?
55. Was versteht man unter "deutscher Mystik" und wer sind ihre Vertreter?
56. Was bedeuten die Ausdrücke "mittelalterlicher Realismus" und "Nominalismus"?
57. Was sind die Hussitenkriege?
58. Was sind die besonderen Merkmale und die geistigen Grundlagen des gotischen Stils? Nennen Sie einige der wichtigsten Bauten der Zeit.
59. Wann und wo wurden die ersten deutschen Universitäten gegründet?
60. Welche Geistesrichtung bezeichnet man mit dem Namen "Humanismus"?

As can easily be seen, this group of questions does not by any means exhaust the subject of the history of German civilization during the latter part of the Middle Ages, but it furnishes a number of topics which, if answered carefully, will assure a fair amount of basic knowledge of that period. The same applies to the next example.

IV. Lessing.

41. Worin besteht Lessings Hauptbedeutung für die deutsche Literatur?
42. Nennen Sie die wichtigsten Gedanken in Lessings Literaturbriefen.
43. Welche Probleme behandelt Lessing in seinem "Laokoon" und zu welchen Schlüssen kommt er?
44. Welche dramaturgischen Hauptfragen kommen in der "Hamburgischen Dramaturgie" zur Besprechung?
45. Wie stellt sich Lessing zur Frage der drei Einheiten?
46. Welche literaturgeschichtliche Bedeutung hat Lessings "Miss Sara Sampson"?
47. Worin liegt die große Bedeutung von Lessings "Minna von Barnhelm"?
48. Welche Aufgaben stellte sich Lessing in seiner "Emilia Galotti"?

49. Warum bezeichnet er sein Werk "Nathan der Weise" als "dramatisches Gedicht"?
50. Welchem Streit verdankt dieses Werk seine Entstehung?
51. Welchen großen Menschheitsgedanken bringt Lessing darin zum dichterischen Ausdruck?
52. Wie verbessert Lessing die alte Fabel von den drei Ringen?
53. Welche metrische Form wurde durch "Nathan" in der deutschen Literatur eingebürgert?

A student who can answer these questions well will be far from being a Lessing scholar, but he will have an essential knowledge of Lessing's contribution to German literature, a foundation upon which later courses can build. The main point is, however, that by having the student answer these questions before the end of the term, we can make sure that he did get this minimum knowledge, instead of waiting to the end to realize that he did not. This, then, seems to be the chief advantage of the system advocated here.

The questions selected will vary with the individual teacher and his opinion of what are the most important elements of his subject. He may invent all the questions himself, or take help from various sources in making up his questionnaire. There is no need of standardization in this field.

IN DER FRÜHE

Kein Schlaf noch kühlt das Auge mir,
 Dort geht schon der Tag herfür
 An meinem Kammerfenster.
 Es wühlet mein verstörter Sinn
 Noch zwischen Zweifeln her und hin
 Und schaffet Nachtgespenster.
 —Ängste, quäle
 Dich nicht länger, meine Seele!
 Freu' dich! schon sind da und dorten
 Morgenglocken wach geworden.

Eduard Mörike.

Registration Trends in Modern Foreign Languages

J. ALAN PFEFFER, *Columbia University*

Echoing the cry that liberal arts education is on the decline,¹ some scholars have expressed due concern for the future of modern language instruction in the United States. To be sure, the problems that confront teachers of French, German, and Spanish are numerous and not to be minimized, but the situation in general is far from disheartening, as an analysis of data would seem to indicate.

According to the *Biennial Survey of Education*, the 62,240 students of modern foreign languages in 1890 formed nearly twenty-one per cent of the total number enrolled in public and private secondary schools in the United States.² Ten years later, when the high school population had doubled, over twenty-five per cent studied German and French (Spanish figures prior to 1910 were too insignificant to be included). This percentage of pupils registered in foreign languages increased to thirty-six per cent in 1910, and exceeded thirty-seven in 1915. By 1922, however, it had decreased to twenty-nine per cent, due largely to the War, which eradicated nearly all German instruction. That three more years passed before the decline was halted is evinced by the *Modern Language Survey* conducted by Professor Wheeler for the American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages.³ In the institutions reporting in 1925, there were 2,335,623 students attending the Spring Session of public and private high schools, and modern language enrollments numbered 715,258, or nearly twenty-six per cent of the total registration.

TABLE 1
ENROLLMENTS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS⁴
UNITED STATES

Year	Total Number of Students	Foreign Languages	Per Cent
1890	297,894	62,240	20.9
1895	461,446	104,667	22.6
1900	630,048	160,557	25.5
1905	786,909	249,843	31.7
1910	817,653	293,887	35.9
1915	1,291,187	483,637	37.4
1922	2,335,623	675,258	28.9
1925	2,778,295*	715,258*	25.7*
1928	3,144,645	838,313	26.6

¹ R. M. Hutchins, "Tradition in Education," *The Harvard Educational Review*, VII (May, 1937), 301-313.

² *Biennial Survey of Education*, 1926-1928, U. S. Department of the Interior (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Press, 1930), pp. 1057 ff.

³ C. A. Wheeler and others, *Enrollment in Foreign Languages in Secondary Schools and Colleges of the United States*, vol. IV of the "Publications of the American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages." (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), pp. 14-16, 95, 369.

⁴ For the years from 1890 to 1910 (exclusive), the figures include the total number of students in schools. All subsequent figures are the totals of schools reporting. Those marked with an asterisk are based on the *Modern Language Survey* and exclude Italian and other foreign languages; the remainder are taken from the *Biennial Survey of Education*, 1926-1928.

The 26.6 ratio for 1928, therefore, really indicates a renewed advance in the number studying French, German, and Spanish, in terms of total enrollment.

Thus we note that while the total enrollment of secondary students has doubled from 1890 to 1900, increased sixty per cent from 1900 to 1910, and doubled again each subsequent decade, foreign language registrations consistently exceeded the relative advances in totals for more than a generation.⁵

The gain in secondary education is, of course, mirrored in trends in higher learning. The total collegiate enrollment in 1890 was 156,756. It increased fifty per cent each decade from 1890 to 1910, sixty-eight per cent from 1910 to 1920, and eighty-two per cent from 1920 to 1930, at which time it exceeded one million (1,085,799).⁶ Valid comparisons with modern language registrations, however, are available only for 1925, the year covered by the Modern Language Survey. At that time 293 universities and colleges, probably including more than one-half of all the bona fide undergraduate students in the United States, reported 259,622 in attendance in the Spring Session.⁷ French, German, Italian, and Spanish courses enlisted 148,198 students constituting 57.2 per cent of the school population.

To arrive at more recent figures, the writer sent questionnaires to 110 colleges and universities in October, 1936.⁸ Eventually, complete returns were received from fifty-eight institutions. Four other schools submitted partially usable figures, and two replied that the information sought was not available. As a result, enrollments in elementary, intermediate, and advanced French, German, Italian, and Spanish, and the number of students majoring in these subjects in 1934-35, 1935-36, and 1936-37 could be tabulated. For practical purposes, only the table including totals is reproduced here in its entirety. (See table, page 22.)

A digest of these figures indicates a slight decline in the modern foreign language percentage in terms of total enrollment from 1935 to 1937. Some institutions (Loyola University and Vassar College) attribute this shrinkage of the language total to recent changes in requirements. The schools reporting incomplete figures (Columbia University, Syracuse University, The University of Indiana, and The University of Wisconsin) index a small gain in the total number of foreign language students during this period.

TABLE 3
ENROLLMENTS IN 47 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Year	Total Number of Students	Foreign Languages	Per Cent
1925	259,622*	148,198*	57.2*
1934-35	124,947	40,215	32.2
1935-36	131,818	39,119	29.7
1936-37	140,726	38,838	27.6

⁵ Biennial Survey of Education, 1930-1932, U. S. Department of the Interior (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Press, 1933), p. 6.

⁶ Cf. Biennial Survey of Education, 1930-1932, p. 6, cited above. All students on the collegiate level are included in these figures.

⁷ Wheeler, *op. cit.*, pp. 382 ff.

⁸ These schools were selected on the basis of an approximate enrollment of one thousand and over, although a few with smaller registrations were also included.

TABLE 2—ENROLLMENTS IN FIFTY-EIGHT AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING* IN THE WINTER SEMESTER OR AUTUMN QUARTER

INSTITUTION	FRENCH		GERMAN		ITALIAN		SPANISH		
	1934-35	1935-36	1936-37	1934-35	1935-36	1936-37	1934-35	1935-36	1936-37
Akron, University of*	206	217	237	115	120	109	0	0	76
Alabama, University of	770	827	800	421	439	420	39	25	850
Arizona, University of	425	476	394	165	148	128	16	17	477
*Baylor, University	190	197	183	106	120	101	0	0	178
Birmingham-Southern College	231	272	249	92	101	95	0	0	190
Brown University*	211	192	197	221	220	180	50	49	52
Bucknell University*	191	233	236	66	163	171	0	0	117
Buffalo, University of	100	93	136	42	102	146	20	10	45
Butler University*	366	293	340	107	155	133	194	0	12
Dartmouth College	587	583	464	412	393	266	31	42	23
Denver, University of	172	222	205	162	103	100	6	4	3
De Pauw University	385	384	396	237	235	225	0	0	109
Florida, University of*	227	213	152	114	161	169	0	0	117
Fordham University	406	424	380	86	87	74	0	0	250
*Georgetown University	155	177	167	42	37	50	0	0	52
Georgia State College	418	398	332	0	0	0	0	0	62
Harvard University	1292	1166	1096	894	671	666	61	92	84
Hawaii, University of	165	153	151	179	142	172	0	0	179
Idaho, University of	283	244	228	209	190	186	0	0	49
Illinois, University of*	1591	1561	1633	1140	1142	1297	62	58	860
*Iowa, State University of	859	807	858	818	760	664	17	17	591
*Long Island, University of	184	159	174	210	182	204	34	31	29
Louisville, University of	216	209	213	188	145	168	0	0	106
*Loyola University (Chicago)	178	148	125	162	142	132	0	0	116
Maine, University of	215	201	239	207	146	149	7	16	87
Miami University	486	503	523	312	317	335	33	35	0
Mississippi State College	129	111	114	312	312	312	0	0	362
Mississippi, University of	400	436	377	147	147	151	5	7	345
Montana State University	256	241	192	166	157	154	0	0	369
Mount Holyoke College	360	327	368	213	213	213	21	13	193
Nebraska, University of	622	621	520	563	542	614	8	5	27
*New Mexico, University of	197	193	228	128	133	116	0	0	238
New York University*	1580	1566	1502	1215	1144	186	0	0	724
*Oberlin College	488	465	486	326	316	305	36	24	147
Oklahoma City University	134	113	109	123	54	58	0	0	28
Omaha, Municipal University	64	49	69	90	80	66	2	5	91
Oregon, University of	424	454	489	213	245	235	39	46	42
Pittsburgh, University of	269	259	269	349	374	377	39	32	139
Purdue University*	243	183	237	578	588	576	0	0	125
Rutgers University*	158	170	147	284	262	0	0	9	99
Saint Olaf College	104	128	109	265	313	303	0	0	21
South Dakota, University of	77	96	79	128	156	140	0	0	63
Temple University*	527	529	592	450	335	529	49	56	30
Tulane College	311	249	240	380	424	455	24	20	22
Toledo, University of*	276	267	215	65	65	11	0	12	125
Vanderbilt University*	260	307	284	214	269	302	2	6	213
Vassar College*	565	435	425	315	297	246	130	116	88
Vermont, University of*	314	303	270	246	228	276	116	75	101
Virginia, University of	371	360	398	223	241	257	141	108	131
Washington College	154	126	127	74	76	57	0	0	112
*Wellesley College	478	462	520	352	306	302	17	29	305
West Virginia University	730	693	708	395	354	349	149	118	139
Western Reserve University*	633	630	561	322	332	296	0	34	52
Wichita, Municipal University of*	625	575	581	590	491	527	43	49	129
*Winthrop College	97	111	94	95	94	128	0	0	116
*Wyoming, University of	467	408	357	27	36	56	0	0	54
Yale University	160	198	225	157	150	132	0	0	53
	384	302	312	322	230	262	34	41	156
TOTAL	22366	21686	21345	15892	15144	15388	1303	1302	1278
									11182
									11309
									10824

*The schools marked with an appended asterisk were not included in the tabulation of Language Majors, referred to later; those preceded by an asterisk were omitted from the tabulation.

In view of the great variance between these figures and the data based on the Modern Language Survey (marked with an asterisk), no fair inference is possible. Similarly, it is difficult to explain why the advance in total college enrollment as reported by President Walters of The University of Cincinnati is not fully reflected in the registration figures noted above. His tabulations of returns from 593 approved institutions indicate a grand total increase in enrollment of eight per cent for 1935 over 1934, against more than seven (7.3) per cent for 1936 over 1935.¹⁰ The forty-seven schools surveyed in this report, on the other hand, merely show a gain of approximately six per cent (5.7 in 1935 and 6.7 in 1936) in the number registered.^{10a} The enrollment in the remaining eleven institutions increased less than three per cent from 1934-35 to 1935-36.¹¹

Of especial interest to teachers in the respective fields are the percentage relations between the various languages.

TABLE 4
FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENROLLMENTS IN 58 COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES

Year	Number of Students				Percentage Relation			
	French	German	Italian	Spanish	French	German	Italian	Spanish
1934-35	22,366	15,892	1,303	11,182	43.9	31.2	2.4	22.5
1935-36	21,686	15,144	1,302	11,309	43.7	30.5	2.5	23.3
1936-37	21,345	15,388	1,278	10,824	43.6	31.5	2.5	22.4

It appears that in the institutions tabulated here, the percentage relation of French, German, and Spanish enrollments from 1935 to 1937 remained essentially one of 4:3:2. Italian departments enlisted only a little over two per cent of all foreign language students during this period. In terms of total registration, approximately 14.3 per cent studied French in 1934-35, 10.6 per cent German, 6.5 per cent Spanish, and 0.8 per cent Italian. In 1936-37 these figures were: French 12.0, German 9.3, Spanish 5.6, and Italian 0.7, respectively.¹² That German has fairly well maintained its percentage of total enrollment since 1932 is revealed by the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation report on trends in German.¹³ An analysis of comparable figures indicates that in 1932-33 and 1933-34 German also claimed approximately 8 per cent of the total number in attendance.

From the Modern Language Survey we gather that in 1925 French enjoyed a considerable preference among college students over other modern

¹⁰ R. Walters, "Statistics of Registration in American Universities and Colleges, 1936," *School and Society*, XLIV (Dec. 19, 1936), 793-811.

^{10a} It indicates, nevertheless, that the sampling of institutions was a felicitous one.

¹¹ For the 1934-35 enrollment totals for these schools, cf. C. S. Marsh, *American Universities and Colleges*, third edition (Washington: American Council on Education, 1936). The figures for 1935-36 were supplied through the kindness of Mr. Emery M. Foster, Chief of the Division of Statistics, U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education.

¹² These percentages are based on the figures in Table 3.

¹³ Cf. Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, "German Enrollment in American Institutions of Higher Learning," *The German Quarterly*, VII (Nov., 1934), 129-144.

languages. For every three students enrolled in Spanish, French enlisted five, and German two. (Only one out of every hundred modern foreign language students studied Italian.) This clearly indicates that in the college curriculum French and Spanish have receded to some extent in favor of German during the last decade.

It is of benefit to note how closely this resembled the situation prevailing in high schools.

TABLE 5
MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE
ENROLLMENTS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS¹⁴

Year	Number of Students			Percentage Relation		
	French	German	Spanish	French	German	Spanish
1890 -----	28,032	34,208	----	45.0	55.0	--
1895 -----	45,746	58,921	----	43.8	56.2	--
1900 -----	65,684	94,873	----	40.8	59.2	--
1905 -----	89,777	160,066	----	36.0	64.0	--
1910 -----	95,671	192,933	5,283	32.6	65.6	1.8
1915 -----	136,131	312,358	35,148	28.2	64.5	7.3
1922 -----	391,781	19,643	263,834	58.0	2.9	39.1
1925 -----	408,517*	38,065*	268,676*	57.1*	5.4*	37.5*
1928 -----	480,120	62,184	296,009	57.3	7.4	35.3

In 1890, fifty-five per cent of all our language pupils preferred German while forty-five per cent elected French. By 1910, German had increased its lead to more than sixty-five per cent, and the French percentage decreased slightly to over thirty-two. At the same time less than two per cent were enrolled in Spanish. The one per cent decline in the German ratio from 1910 to 1915 is largely due to the increase in Spanish, and does not at all seem to foreshadow the disaster which overtook the study of German when the United States entered the World War. After a period in which it practically disappeared from the curriculum, German once more began to attract the interest of foreign language students, and from 1922 to 1928 its percentage increased from approximately three to slightly over seven. This gain in popularity was evident as late as 1931, as Professor Vail pointed out in his article on trends in German.¹⁵ Since 1922, the year in which French and Spanish reached their respective peaks, both languages, especially the latter, have receded as German has advanced. The report published by the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation in November, 1933, reflects this gain even more vividly, although only thirty-five schools are included for which complete data are available.¹⁶ The German enrollment in these schools totaled 7966 in 1914. As a result of the World War it decreased to 2504 in 1920-21 but increased again to 7134 in 1932-33.

¹⁴ Cf. Table 1.

¹⁵ C. C. D. Vail, "Present Trends in German," *The German Quarterly*, V (March, 1932), 58-64.

¹⁶ H. W. Pfund, "Enrollment in American Colleges," *The German Quarterly*, VI (Nov., 1933), 175 ff.

One other component factor that may reflect the trend in modern language ratios is the number of students concentrating in French, German, Italian, and Spanish. It was found that in the thirty-nine institutions out of a total of fifty-eight reporting (cf. Table 2), 758 undergraduates and graduates majored in French or Romance languages in 1934-35 and 693 in 1936-37.¹⁷ The total number specializing in German increased from 186 to 194 during that period, while the total for Spanish decreased from 155 to 115, and the number of Italian majors doubled from 4 to 8.

Finally, it was noted that in the fifty-eight schools tabulated above, more than one-half of all German, Spanish, and Italian, and one-third of all French students were registered in elementary courses. About thirty per cent studied intermediate French, German, and Spanish, and twenty per cent Italian. The remainder were enrolled in advanced classes. This seems to correspond with the Modern Language Survey findings according to which nearly forty per cent studied elementary languages.¹⁸ Interestingly enough, this group constituted half the number of pupils enlisted in the first two years in language courses in high school.¹⁹

Although it is somewhat hazardous to generalize because of the varying sets of figures presented here, the following conclusions seem tenable: In the high school curriculum, modern foreign languages as a whole have maintained their position over a period of nearly forty years—from 1890 to 1928—and it is reasonable to assume that they still enroll one-fifth to one-fourth of the total number in attendance in secondary schools despite the changes in requirements and courses of study. Viewed separately, French showed a constant gain in the number registered since 1890, and its ratio to all the students enrolled increased from 9.4 per cent in 1890 to 16.6 per cent in 1922, only to recede to 15.7 in 1928. German, most popular of the foreign languages prior to the World War, with a percentage of 11.4 in 1890 which had doubled (23.6) by 1910, enlisted only 0.8 per cent of all students in attendance in 1922, but advanced markedly to 2.0 per cent in 1928. During the first two decades from 1890 to 1910 Spanish figures were too insignificant to be tabulated. Following that date, however, the number of pupils enrolled in Spanish as related to the total of students registered increased to approximately 10.0 per cent in 1925 and has receded slightly ever since.

The positions of these languages in the college curriculum cannot be determined as accurately. It seems certain, nevertheless, that German and Italian have improved their relative positions in the last two decades at the expense of French and Spanish, thus approximating the trend noted for secondary schools. Recent figures, moreover, reflect no appreciable changes.

Education in general, on the other hand, has undergone incessant changes during these many years. Schools have constantly, and in many instances radically, revised their curricula in an effort to provide training for the

¹⁷ Of these numbers, 19 are listed as modern language majors in 1934-35 and 5 in 1936-37.

¹⁸ Wheeler, *op. cit.*, p. 415.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 353.

growing complexities of modern life, and it is indeed to the credit of foreign languages that they have lost so relatively little ground.

Fortified with a knowledge of the respective significance of their subject, then, modern foreign language teachers should face the future more optimistically, and, what is most important, more aggressively.

BERICHTE UND MITTEILUNGEN

The William Alpha Cooper Prizes in German

These lines are written in the hope that the success of the Cooper Prizes in California may stimulate colleagues in other states to inaugurate similar contests. A copy of the following announcement went out to every public and private high school of California in which German is taught. The Educational Directory, published annually, carries the names of German teachers in the public high schools, and these were addressed individually.

In recognition of his long and distinguished service to the encouragement and development of the study of German in the schools of California, friends of William Alpha Cooper have established a number of prizes to be awarded to pupils in California high schools for translations from German into English. The matter to be translated accompanies this letter, and consists of a prose passage and a short poem, both by modern German writers. The conditions of the contest are as follows:

1. Competing translations are to be submitted on or before April 15, 1937, typed on one side of the paper.
2. Each translation must be accompanied by a statement, signed by the principal, that the competitor is a pupil at present enrolled in the school.
3. Each MS must be accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope.
4. Awards will be announced not later than May 20, 1937.
5. The committee of judges will be chosen from the teaching staff of Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley.
6. Any high school pupil may compete, whether or not German is taught in the school.
7. Any pupil may submit translations of both prose and verse, but may expect only one award.
8. Translations will be judged for (1) accuracy, (2) quality of English, (3) artistic merit.
9. A first prize of \$5, a second prize of \$3, and a third prize of \$2 will be awarded for the best translations of the prose passage.
10. A first prize of \$5, a second prize of \$3, and a third prize of \$2 will be awarded for the best translations of the poem.
11. A number of handsomely illustrated German books will be awarded to meritorious translations other than prize-winners.
12. All communications should be addressed to: Executive Head, Department of Germanic Languages, Stanford University.

Commenting on these conditions, the following points may be mentioned. William Alpha Cooper, for many years head of the German Department at Stanford University, was widely known throughout the state and greatly beloved by the students who came under his influence. His name has publicity value. It would probably be desirable to connect any similar contest with a local figure of standing.

We have taken the set passages from modern and mostly from living authors, and the prose passage is derived from some American textbook; in

the first announcement the names are not given, but in the follow-up letter to be discussed below, the source of the prose passage is named, in the hope that some pupils will be encouraged to read the rest of the story. We like a rhymed poem of definite rhythmical pattern and of fairly simple content. For our first contest we chose Hofmannsthal's "Die Beiden," this year it was Ricarda Huch's "Sturmlied." It has been our experience that translations which did not retain the rhyme fell so far short of the original that in practice they could be excluded from consideration. — Further comments follow the numbering of the contest conditions:

1. The due-date should be near the end of the school year, so that even first-year pupils may compete; it must be early enough to permit the awards to be made before the schools close for the summer.
2. The certification of the pupil serves to call the attention of the principal to the contest and to German. This seems important in view of the antagonism toward foreign language study on the part of high school administrators.
4. The checks are not sent to the winners direct, but to the school principal, with the request that the award be announced at some public exercise of the school. The advertising value of this simple scheme need not be labored.
7. A translation contest seems to the writer superior to any other for high school purposes. Translation is one of the exercises of the classroom, and in preparing a translation the pupil is right in line with the school itself. It has been not uncommon for teachers whose pupils sent in no MSS to go over the set passages in class and discuss the problems presented by them. In short the contest itself is educational.
8. A translation can be judged with something like objective accuracy, and there is usually a high correlation between the number of errors in the interpretation of the original and the effectiveness of the translation as English.
9. A distribution of the prize money seems desirable, thus extending the scope of the attendant publicity.
11. Donors are sometimes found for the illustrated books; but the lovely booklets of the Inselbücherei, Meyers Bücherei or the Weberschiffchen-Bücherei cost little money and are excellent for this purpose.

The self-addressed stamped envelope mentioned in point 3 is a cardinal feature of our plan, for this is the device by which we try to reach out beyond the contest into the pupil's school and home environment, and establish some sort of personal connection. Into each such envelope goes a 3-page mimeographed letter, containing (1) information about the contest (there is nothing so discouraging as not to know how a contest came out), (2) a correct translation of the set passages, (3) comments on the translation problems involved, (4) comments on the English of the MSS submitted, (5) encouragement to participate in the next contest. This year's letter, apropos of good English and translation English, included these remarks: "It is more serious when you write things that nobody can understand. Read the following phrases aloud to somebody: 'Suddenly a very soft rustle blew out of his mouth'; 'the movements like those of one of the rudder'; 'Mori respirated his body'; 'unceasingly the movements as that of a river'; 'it colored itself tender'; 'now he swells as an oarsman'; 'perhaps a signal of life blown out of further distant.' These and many other examples suggest that you have a wrong idea about translation: you think that if you get English equivalents for the German words and string them along on the

paper, you have 'translated' the original. But that isn't it at all. First you must find out what the German author really meant to say; then you must try to repeat what he said so that an American who doesn't know any German will understand it. If you always did that, you wouldn't write nonsense and call it a 'translation'."

Copies of this letter were sent to the German teachers and also to the principals of all the schools involved, in the latter case with an accompanying note that called attention to the educational aspect of the contest as such. It may be assumed that this letter was seen by many persons besides the addressees: by parents and friends of the family, by schoolmates, other teachers and educators, etc. The "educational" effect of our undertaking on the school and the community centers in this letter, and our contest seems to us capable of wielding a very considerable influence as the years go by.

This year's competition, the third annual one, brought in 198 MSS representing 49 schools and every part of the state. Cash prizes went to both public and private high schools, to both boys and girls, to German names like Lewohl and Meyers or English names like Rapp and Simons.

The writer will be glad to answer inquiries regarding our California contest, and invites correspondence with any who may be interested.

Stanford University.

—Bayard Quincy Morgan.

Meeting of the American Association of Teachers of German

The sixth annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of German took place at the Hotel Drake in Chicago on December 27, 1937. There was an attendance of 200 or more. Nothing happened that could excite the Chicago press or general public very much, if at all. Four highly interesting papers were presented, dealing with various phases of teacher training problems. The discussions following the papers were animated and gave proof once more that freedom of speech about professional problems is entirely compatible with personal amiability and good fellowship.

The President for the coming year is Professor Edward F. Hauch, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York; the Secretary for the next three years, Professor Charles M. Purin, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

A more detailed report of this meeting will appear in a later number.

Hamilton College.

—Edward F. Hauch.

Meeting of the Modern Language Association

The forty-fifth annual meeting of the Modern Language Association, held December 28-30 at the Drake Hotel in Chicago on invitation of Northwestern University, was a success in more than one way.

The Officers of the Association, the Local Committee, as well as the Management of the Hotel deserve high praise for their foresight in planning and their organization in conducting the convention: rooms for meetings were spacious and well ventilated, lobbies allowed ample facilities for overflow and private congregation, meals were served dexterously and without friction, the invitation luncheon came off without the usual breadlines and delay, the dinner, spiced with timed speeches, culminated in an exquisite and fitting entertainment: folk tunes and madrigals sung by music students of Northwestern University. (What a long way we have travelled from the rough and tumble stunts of early days of the Association and what progress musical appreciation has made in this country during the last 20 years!)

The academic output justifies an equally favorable report. The three

papers of the General Meeting, scholarly in content and stimulating in ideas, were delivered with zest, wit, and more than adequate art of speaking. The reviewer cannot pride himself on having listened to all the 30 papers presented at the seven meetings devoted to German (including the one on Anglo-German relations), but the twenty-two he was able to take in showed a high average of scholarship and achievement. It would be presumptuous on his part to pass judgment on the work performed in such greatly divergent fields as Semantics and the Political Thought of Francis Lieber, as Germanic Accentuation and a Sociological Approach to Literature, but he noted with pleasure the diversification of access due to different interest, individuality, and training. Here a highly philosophical paper on Grillparzer, there a delicately sketched miniature of Amalie Schoppe, here a whimsically outlined development of the word "Verhältnis", there an ingenious interpretation of a leaflet from Lessing's *Nachlass*, a deep probing into the rooting of Hauptmann's dramatic struggle. Few papers contented themselves with undigested enumeration of facts (which should have no place on our programs) and all of them (at last!) observed rather scrupulously the limit of time allotted.

Some progress has been made toward solving the problem outlined by the Committee on Trends of Scholarship in their publication printed by the Association, which every member should know and of which many are still blissfully ignorant. But this progress is as yet exceedingly small and does not allow an overly optimistic report.

The Germanic Section, to be sure, fulfilled its purpose with seven papers of a diversity of interest, scope, and approach. But the Groups were far from satisfying the requirements for which they were originally created. "The Program Committee", the Circular of the above mentioned publication, reads, "regards a Discussion Group as a closely knit unit of scholars interested in a restricted field and cooperatively engaged in exploring the possibilities for contribution to research. Such a unit should . . . endeavor to investigate special topics and evolve meritorious projects. Persons so engaged are its active members, whether or not present regularly at annual meetings." Groups IV and V came nearest to presenting such unified programs, the one in restricting the chronological period to be covered, the other by choosing as a topic for papers the work of Gerhart Hauptmann. Yet, the last step, turning away from a program of papers to a symposium or discussion, is still to be made. In Group I a "Symposium on Semantics" was actually announced in print, but the result did not quite justify the expression. In Group II an instructive report on work done or proposed in 17th century literature was given as a summary of a meritorious enquête, undertaken by the research committee of the Group. In both Groups discussion was rather lively and further unification should meet with little difficulty.

Great disaster, in contrast, befell the Goethe group. Its chairman was prevented from presiding, its principal speaker was too ill to appear but sent part of his paper, which disappeared mysteriously en route. A substitute paper was offered but not accepted by the chairman pro tem for fear of setting a precedent. There remained, then, the welcome greeting from the President of the Goethegesellschaft and three very short unconnected papers. At 4:45 (instead of 5:50) the meeting was closed. No committees were instated or confirmed, no business was transacted and the substantial bibliography presented by John A. Kelly and the product solely of his pen, purse, and planning was received without a word of thanks and further encouragement.

All this is said not in a spirit of fault finding but for the purpose of

showing that our group life is practically non-existent. We do not know the constituents of the groups; few officers are aware of the lists carried by the main office in New York; potential members have no way of cooperating with each other. Practically all the work of organizing remains to be done and requires an unceasing amount of thankless and self-denying activity. There is not only the law of inertia to be counteracted but a great deal of real opposition must be overcome. One group actually voted against a unified program, a procedure hardly within its jurisdiction as long as the group is not a body with a nucleus of sustaining members. Debutants are loathe to forego the privilege of exhibiting their attractions at this intellectual slave market. Their arguments for the old string of papers are not without merit. But that does not mean, as far as I can see, that we should have to abandon the aim toward which we are steering, but that ways and means must be found to satisfy the different needs of the constituency of the Association. So far, we have always striven to avoid conflicts in the scheduling of groups. Perhaps this policy was wrong or has become so in the light of our new objectives. Perhaps we should try to create an increasing number of conflicts so that groups will decrease in size and a greater opportunity will be given to actual participation in an organized discussion of topics covering a much wider field of our research and attended preponderantly by responding scholars. There ought to be an intensive and general airing of ideas on this question and suggestions might be made to the Program Committee while these problems are still fresh in our minds.

Such a close organization and cooperation is not an impractical pipe dream. Moreover, it becomes imperative in the face of the crisis of the Association and the still graver crisis of the humanistic studies in Europe.

An association of over four thousand members, if it is not to become a soulless machine, must organize into a closely cooperative body of responsible units. Groups must mean more than an hour and a room and a list of names and papers. American scholarship, on the other hand, will have to take over the cooperative enterprises (bibliographies, collections, publications, etc.) which European civilization will soon no longer be willing or able to support. The exodus of scholars from four European countries, Russia, Italy, Germany, and Spain, has altered our responsibility and will continue to alter it. And a possible new cataclysm in Europe (which the Gods may defer if they cannot prevent it) must not find us unprepared to carry the load devolving upon our shoulders.

Officers of the groups for 1938:

Group I: Alfred Senn (Wisconsin); Edward Sehrt (George Washington)

Group II: Albert W. Aron (Illinois); Arpad Steiner (Hunter College)

Group III: Max Diez (Bryn Mawr); Robert T. Clark, Jr. (Louisiana State University)

Group IV: Hans Jaeger (Princeton); T. C. Dunham (Ohio Wesleyan)

Group V: Heinz Bluhm (Yale); Helmut Rehder (Wisconsin)

The Johns Hopkins University.

—Ernst Feise.

BÜCHERBESPRECHUNGEN

Das Bild Laurence Sternes in Deutschland von der Aufklärung bis zur Romantik. Hallamore, Gertrude Joyce. Germanische Studien CLXXII (1936); 87 pp.

It was time that such a study should have been undertaken. The works of Baker and Thayer 1899 and 1906 were pioneer investigations. Bibliographically extensive, they could not treat all influences exhaustively. Moreover German literary history operates with subtler and more precise categories than it did at the beginning of the century. The studies of Baker and Thayer opened up a new field. They were attended or promptly followed by special studies, of Sterne's influence on Hippel and Jean Paul by Czerny, 1904; on Wieland by Bauer and by Behmer, 1898 and 1899; on J. G. Jacobi by Longo, 1898; on Heine by Ransmeier and Vacano, both in 1907; and by Gaismeier on Kerner, 1899. These works provided Dr. Hallamore with her starting point, for with more recent specific studies of the influence of Sterne on individual authors she seems to have been unfamiliar, and this is to be regretted. It is a shortcoming rarely noted in a study originating at a German university, and little to be expected in a work done under the guidance of Borchardt and appearing in so distinguished a series as the *Germanische Studien*. In so attractive an essay we are loath to be deprived of any aspect the theme would seem to include.

The monograph really gives us more than it promises. We not only have a varying picture of Sterne as seen by different groups but we have a picture of the different groups looking at Sterne with varying emotions. We see the "Aufklärer" looking with favor upon *Tristram Shandy* and turning their backs upon the *Sentimental Journey*. We see the Rokoko group somewhat in doubt. The sensitiveness to physical pleasures they are ready to accept, but why take the sorrows of others so much to heart? Precisely the note of common human sympathy binds the "Empfindsamen" together into a fervidly tearful group. The classic authors look upon Sterne with respect. He is for them the clear seeing prophet who helps to banish pedantry and hypocrisy. The romanticists exchange with Sterne a quiet smile in appreciation of the irony they think they detect.

The entire picture is composed with an artistry that extends to details. The style is clear and graceful. It is possible to bring too much into a group picture. Only the characteristic attitude of the individuals can be indicated and this can be done not by exhaustive quotation, but by careful selection of the most typical utterances.¹

In the whole picture there is but one figure whose attitude is hazily and uncertainly sketched and that is the figure of Goethe. Out of the mass of quotations available the author has not selected the most enlightening and characteristic ones.² Had she read the dissertation of Klingemann, she might have been led to better choices and had she read what he said about "Eigenheiten in Wilhelm Meister" she might have softened her assertion (p.

¹This is, of course, more important than correct citation. In footnote 37 read Friedrich Bauer; note 38 read *Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte*; note 40 *Teutscher Merkur*, also note 42; note 125 the volume of Goethes *Werke* Weimar is omitted. It should be I 42 (2). The date of writing was Jan. 5, 1826 not 1827; note 158 the volume No. is CXVIII. In the "Literaturverzeichnis" for Ranschoff read Ranshoff, for Harwey Thayer read Harvey Thayer, for Wihau read Wihan.

²Before his death in 1917 my colleague W. R. R. Pinger had assembled 148 passages in which Goethe refers to Sterne. This work was accomplished before the Register-Bände to the Weimar edition had appeared. W. R. R. Pinger, *Laurence Sterne and Goethe*. University of California Publications in Modern Philology X 1; pp. 1-65. Berkeley, 1920.

59): "Das Lebensziel des klassischen Menschen war die Vollendung seines Typus; . . . Sterne dagegen ist der Schöpfer der Sonderlinge."⁸

In her concluding paragraph the author suggests as a further topic for investigation the influence of Sterne on other German writers of the nineteenth century, particularly on Immermann and Raabe, from which we may conclude that she is not aware of the essays of Friedrich Bauer, *Program*, Wien, 1896; and of Emil Doernenburg in the *Germanic Review* of 1931.

Comedy in Germany in the first half of the eighteenth century, by Betsy Aikin-Sneath. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936; 122 pp.

Besides introduction and conclusion the volume offers the following chapters: II. The theory of comedy in Germany; Gottsched and his predecessors. III. The theory of comedy in Germany; J. E. Schlegel. IV. Popular comedy. V. and VI. Regular comedy. These last three chapters represent pioneer investigation. As the author says in the introduction: "Especial emphasis has been laid on those anonymous plays which are usually omitted from the general histories of German comedy." Translations of the plays of foreign nations are also taken into account and with profit. For example, in speaking (p. 71) of the plays of Picander and König (1725 and 1726) the author observes:

It is probable that they were influenced by Molière and also by Holberg—a significant fact, for Holberg is usually considered to have been introduced into Germany some fifteen or twenty years later with Detharding's translations and Borkenstein's *Bookesbeutel*.

Even the well informed will find himself fortified by new and useful information after reading these chapters. Chapter IV especially breaks into no man's land, for we have a clearer conception even of the plays of the English comedians than of the comedies of their late descendants. The author bases the study on the texts of anonymous plays that are difficult to find. She might at least have told us where she found them. We only learn that many of them are not listed in the British Museum catalogue or the Prussian *Gesamtkatalog*.

Chapters II and III represent a task of a different nature. Here the attempt is made to compress all the theory involved into thirty-six pages, a needless effort since the length and breadth of the book seem to invite a greater thickness. Gottsched altered his opinions but little in the forty-six years from 1720 until his death, consequently his views can be readily summarized, but Schlegel's theory during the ten years of his life as a critic underwent notable developments and one must be cautious about accepting any of his opinions as final.

Moreover it is not possible to define even Gottsched to every one's satisfaction. To some he is "Gottsched the reformer," "Gottsched der Deutsche," to others he is the incorrigible imitator of the French, and compromise is difficult. On page 16 we read:

Though in matters of literary taste, he accepted the standards of the French, he was at heart a fervent lover of German culture, "von rohem Patriotismus trunken," and this union of veneration for foreign traditions in art and of pride in his fatherland has made his work a curious mixture of imitation and independence.

One group of observers will agree with this. Another would demand at least a shifting of emphasis:

⁸Klingemann, Gisbert. *Goethes Verhältnis zu Laurence Sterne*. Marburg Diss., 1924, discusses (p. 34 ff.) "Die Bedeutung der 'Eigenheiten' für Goethes Schaffen," with particular reference to *Wilhelm Meister*.

Though he felt himself to be a fervent lover of German culture, nevertheless in matters of literary taste he accepted the standards of the French and his veneration of foreign traditions in art prevented him from transcending imitation despite his pride in his fatherland and his declaration of independence.

"After all," they might assert, "Gottsched insisted upon a common standard of taste applicable to all nations. He declared every national taste to be bad taste. One who held such a view cannot have been a fervent lover of his own culture possessed of an 'intense nationalism' (p. 38)"¹

Before considering the next chapter I cannot but express a regret. The book should have been called the German comedy 1700-1754. There is no logic in ending with 1750 but Lessing's *Abhandlung von dem weinerlichen oder rührenden Lustspiel* would have offered a goal toward which the whole discussion might have pointed. Gellert, as Lessing points out, fails to make certain distinctions. "Das Possenspiel will nur zum Lachen bewegen; das weinerliche Lustspiel will nur rühren; die wahre Komödie will beydes." Our author too fails sometimes to make this distinction. "He (Schlegel) was in greater sympathy with contemporary movements (than Gottsched), with the growth of sentiment and the resultant *comédie larmoyante* (p. 39)"² In reality Schlegel, before Lessing, had made the same distinctions and defended only the last named form.² The *comédie larmoyante* Schlegel defines at one point simply as "Handlungen niedriger Personen, welche die Leidenschaften erwecken," but this is a neutral statement and does not justify the assertion (Aikin-Sneath p. 37) that he said laughter is not essential to comedy. That Schlegel really believed in the mixed genre is shown by his statement (Werke III, 287) "daß eine Komödie, so sehr es ihre Absicht und Bestimmung ist, Lachen zu erwecken, doch allezeit mit Erregung einiger Leidenschaften vermischt seyn muß."

On page 37 we read: "All other types of drama, whether pastoral play, sentimental comedy, or even tragedy of middle-class life ("Handlungen niedriger Personen, welche die Leidenschaften erwecken") were considered as comedies" (i. e. by Schlegel). It is misleading to translate this sort of "Handlung" here as "middle-class tragedy." We think immediately of Lillo's *Merchant of London*, first translated into German three years after Schlegel's death 1751, or of Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson* 1755, but Schlegel, as his examples show, was thinking of such plays as Nivelle de la Chausée's *Gouvernante*, which, to be sure, arouses passions, but is in no sense a middle-class tragedy.

To page 34: Schlegel is here quoted as saying that history in comedies should correspond to what the audience believes it to have been. Say rather he demanded that historical personalities should have the characteristics popularly imputed to them. This is a distinction with a difference.

It is true (p. 37) that Schlegel in his essay on Shakespeare found fault with the English dramatists for disregarding the unities of time and place, but it should have been added that in his *Gedanken zur Aufnahme des dänischen Theaters* he specified the unities of time and place as unessential and attacked Gottsched for insisting upon them.

It is true (p. 33) that Schlegel insisted the comedy would be too life-like without verse, but it is also true, as Lessing pointed out (*Hamburgische Dramaturgie* XII) that after his experiment in *Die stumme Schönheit* he completed no comedy in verse, and furthermore in the *Gedanken zur Auf-*

¹Critische Dichtkunst, ed. 3, Leipzig 1742; p. 130.

²In the discussion of Schlegel I have made full use, with the author's permission, of a dissertation deposited in the Univ. of California library, Charles E. Borden, *J. E. Schlegel als Vorläufer Lessings*, 1937.

nahme des dänischen Theaters he admitted that prose was more suited to comedy than verse.

These examples will suffice to show that it is not possible to give a correct idea of Schlegel's dramaturgic views in a sketch of nine pages.

With agreeable anticipations we turned to appendices II and III, "Chronological list of translations of foreign comedies" and "Chronological list of original comedies." What could be more welcome in our handbook than a check list of the comedies in Germany during the period in question. To be sure, we already had Gottsched's *Nötiger Vorrath*, but how many of us find this on our private shelves? After an hour's study I failed to find the exact relation of these check lists to Gottsched's "Verzeichnis." In five instances Gottsched is cited as a source in the footnotes, yet Gottsched offers many titles that are not to be found here. On the other hand this list also supplements Gottsched. The comparison is not easy. Dr. Aikin-Sneath has found for many plays an author not known to Gottsched. Sometimes the author is a foreign playwright and the name of the play is therefore to be sought in Appendix II. There are no cross references pointing the way to the original. The compiler, of course, had to determine what was a comedy. Operas and "Schäferspiele" seem to have been omitted consistently and no doubt properly. The modern conception of comedy differs from that of Gottsched and his time and often no doubt the title alone could serve as a guide, but if *Des Königs von Frankreich und sogenannndten Printzen von Wallis kluges und närrisches Lust- und Trauerspiel . . .* (1708) is included, why not also G. Pondo, *Tragico Cömodia von einem adelichen Jüngling* (1719) and other works listed as "Tragico Comödiae. Under the year 1747 is listed Marivaux *Sammlung einiger Lustspiele*, but to find out which plays these were one must refer to Gottsched.

The compilation of Appendix III would seem to be beset with fewer difficulties but I readily discovered in Gottsched's list seventeen plays, all of them seemingly comedies, that were not visible here. Among the plays not included were Schlegel's *Triumph der guten Frauen* (1748), Lessing's *Damon* (first printed 1747) and his *Die alte Jungfer* (1749). If one should ask why *Der junge Gelehrte* and other early plays of Lessing are missing, the answer would be that they were produced only but not published. This is an answer but not a satisfactory answer. From Schmid's *Chronologie des deutschen Theaters*, from many local theatrical histories, from Meyer's *Schröders Leben* and similar sources a satisfactory list could be compiled. We still need such a list.

Despite these minor disappointments we are deeply grateful for the handbook and hope for a second edition revised and enlarged.

The work is tastefully and profitably illustrated, is well printed, and well proofread. The printer's devil assigned *Der geschäftige Müssiggänger* (page 76) to 1793 instead of 1743 and made August Wilhelm Schlegel (page 77) the brother of Johann Adolf Schlegel.

University of California.

—Lawrence M. Price.

Der pädagogische Gehalt der deutschen Romantik. Zur erziehungs-wissenschaftlichen Würdigung des romantischen Romans. Alfred Franz. 132 S. Felix Meiner Verlag, Leipzig, 1937.

Es ist erstaunlich, daß eine geistige Bewegung wie die Romantik wohl eingehend auf literarischem, aesthetischem, philosophischem und politischem Gebiet untersucht, aber kaum auf ihre pädagogischen Absichten und Errungenschaften hin erforscht worden ist. Unter diesen Gesichtspunkten prüft das vorliegende Buch den romantischen Roman (Tieck, Schlegel, Novalis,

Brentano, Arnim, Eichendorff), mit dem Ergebnis, daß die Frühromantik pädagogischen Fragen egoistische Gleichgültigkeit, die Spätromantik ihnen religiösen und politischen Ernst entgegenbrachte. Keine der beiden Dichtergenerationen ist zu einer praktisch anwendbaren Theorie der Erziehung gelangt. Dennoch haben beide durch ihr Interesse an menschlicher Bildung zu pädagogischen Zielen späterer Epochen beigetragen. Der Zugang zu diesem Bildungsinteresse ist nicht eindeutig bestimmt, ist vielmehr derartig von allgemeinen Lebensproblemen verdeckt, daß sich der Verfasser ihm nur indirekt, auf dem Umweg über eine Analyse der Auffassung vom Menschen nähern kann. Das wäre eine gigantische Arbeit, wenn der Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit und Abrundung gemacht würde. Hier wird die Hauptarbeit in zwei Kapiteln geleistet, in denen der Verfasser in überraschender Kürze und Prägnanz die Gefühls- und Denkstruktur der beiden Dichtergenerationen einander gegenüberstellt. Alles Material, das pädagogisch irgendwie nutzbar gemacht werden kann — Lebensalter, Geschichtsauffassung, Naturerlebnis, Kunst, Freundschaft, Liebe, Tod, Gemeinschaft, Religion, Staat — wird auf seinen erzieherischen Gehalt in großen Zügen untersucht, daß ein weiteres Kapitel und ein Schlußwort nur noch Neugruppierungen und Folgerungen vorzunehmen brauchen. Zuweilen wird längst getane Arbeit nur noch einmal geleistet, ohne daß dies allerdings den gewinnenden Eindruck der Gesamtdarstellung beschwert.

Gewinnend, ja verlockend erscheinen die Gegenüberstellungen, welche die Frühromantik als egoistisch, traditionslos, unmoralisch, spekulativ und die Spätromantik als sozial, traditionsgebunden, moralisch, christlich-praktisch bezeichnen. Dadurch werden die beiden Gruppen so weit auseinander gerückt, daß nur wenig Gemeinsames noch zwischen ihnen besteht, nur noch die Abneigung von Aufklärung und Sturm und Drang. Unter dieser Beleuchtung erscheint die Frühromantik als sentimentalische Jünglingspsychologie, welche in einem Gefühl des „Nicht-mehr und Noch-nicht“ die Gegenwart nur als Durchgang zwischen Vergangenheit und Zukunft erfaßt und daher weder für das Kind noch für den tätigen Mann wirkliches Verständnis hat. Die Spätromantik aber bescheidet sich auf die Gegenwart mit einer frommen Andacht vor der Vergangenheit, hat Achtung vor Wirklichkeit und tüchtigem Handeln und räumt daher der praktischen und moralischen Ausbildung größeren Wert ein. In ihrer Unverbindlichkeit kennt die Frühromantik nur Gespräch und Geselligkeit, während sich die späte zur bürgerlichen Gemeinschaft verbunden fühlt. Wo jene auf „Bildung“, auf möglichst freie Entfaltung natürlicher Kräfte im Einzelnen hinzielt, entwickelt diese den Begriff der „Zucht“ zu „einem Gefühl der schicksalhaften Zugehörigkeit zu einer Gemeinschaft“ (101).

Auf die Bedeutung der jüngeren Romantik für die Ideologie der konservativen Revolution und des totalen Staates ist wiederholt hingewiesen worden; auch die Untersuchung von Franz kann diese Beziehungen nur bestätigen. Andererseits aber gewinnt man den Eindruck, daß der Verfasser bei aller Kritik des romantischen „Bildungs“-begriffes nicht die tieferen Ursprünge erfaßt, aus denen die unermüdliche Denkarbeit der Frühromantiker um das Wesen des Menschen entstammt. Und diese liegen tiefer als in der Sphäre des einzelnen, empirischen Ich, das Franz für das Fehlen einer endgültigen Erziehungslehre verantwortlich macht. Schon die Gewandtheit, mit der er die verwickelte Frühromantik auf eine einzige Formel bringt, muß einen stutzig machen. Hier, wo noch alles im Werden ist, kann kaum eine zielbewußte Pädagogik erwartet werden, sie käme denn aus dem Geiste der Aufklärung selbst. Daß aber ein Streben nach Bildung (und nicht nur ein Besitz von Bildung [96]) den Romantikern vorschwebte, sollte aus Schlegel und Novalis, aus ihrem Ringen mit Goethe und Schiller deutlich werden.

Es ist zu fragen, ob die Untersuchung des Romans allein zur Folgerung auf den pädagogischen Gehalt der Romantik ausreicht, und ob nicht ein Eingehen auf die philosophische Literatur, — nicht nur bei Schlegel und Novalis, wie Franz es tun muß, sondern auch bei Fichte, Schelling und Steffens, — die Ansicht vom „Bildungsbegriff“ wesentlich vertieft hätte. Erst mit diesen Einschränkungen wäre dem Verfasser dahin recht zu geben, daß „Bildung“ für die Frühromantik eine „reine Idee“, für die spätromantik aber Bescheidung auf die Wirklichkeit bedeutete.

In seinen Abgrenzungen zwischen Pädagogik und Literaturgeschichte läßt der Verfasser größte Vorsicht und Rücksicht walten. Jedoch in der Unterscheidung zwischen Romantik und vorher- und nebenher gehenden Literatur- und Lebensstilen wird vor der Schärfe der Scheidung kaum das kontinuierlich Gemeinsame gesehen. Aber das sind Mängel, oder vielmehr Erwartungen, die außerhalb des klar und ansprechend geschriebenen Buches fallen.

University of Wisconsin.

—Helmut Rehder.

Meine sämtlichen Werke, Leo Slezak. Edited with exercises and vocabulary by Roy Temple House and Johannes Malthaner. The University of Oklahoma. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1937.

Slezak's partial autobiography, as humorous as its title, is well edited and is worth editing. That there is evidently a demand for modern stories in normal, everyday language is evinced by the recent additions to German school texts. In this story there is scarcely an idiom that is not usual and useable, the style is simple, the word list neither excessive in length nor technical. Slezak's humor and good nature are infectious, and his personal triumph over early poverty and difficulties of all sorts, told as it is without either false modesty or false heroism, offers the kind of inspiration that is wholesome for the American student. No learner needs to be especially musical to follow the singer's life story with interest and amusement, but if he has even the slightest musical background the tale will be doubly stimulating, with its mention of various operas and its anecdotes of famous singers and composers. Its appreciation of Adolf Robinson, the singer and teacher, who also played such a role in the life of Friedrich Schorr, is especially delightful. To this man the world in large measure owes both of these singers.

There are no notes, which in itself is indication of the simplicity of the text as well as of the fullness of the vocabulary, in which most of the needed explanations, as in the names of operas, etc., are given. In a few cases the vocabulary might offer a single word, such as would be used in translation, besides or in place of the more cumbersome circumlocution given. We would suggest for *Freikarte*, pass; for *Einsatz*, p. 40, cue; for *Wunschzettel*, (Christmas) list; for *Opernpartie*, operatic role; for *Holzverschlag*, p. 27, cubbyhole; for *Hofoperntheater*, royal opera house; for *Hosenträger*, suspenders is enough without *pair of*; *ausstudieren* is humorously used, and the vocabulary meaning, *cease to study*, does not show this; *aus* seems to be more exactly given by *finish* than by *cease*. *Ich hatte ausstudiert*, p. 2, is: I had finished my studies. The humor lies also in the fact that Slezak is speaking of the fourth class in the Realschule. For *bis auf den heutigen Tag*, (p. 5), till today, to this very day, sound more idiomatic than *up to today*. Under *Hosennaht*, *Hand an der* — should indicate the military nature of this position; to blush is too mild for *feuerrot werden*, p. xxii. The Othello mentioned is Verdi's opera, not the play of Shakespeare on which the libretto is based (p. xlvi).

The text is suitable either for rapid reading or as a class text. The

Übungen are useful and sensible; a pupil working with the text as outside reading might care to test himself with the *Fragen*. As class material, most teachers would normally make up their own questions.

The second part of the autobiography, *Wortbruch*, seems, to judge from its title, to continue in the same vein as *Meine sämtlichen Werke*. If so, it is worth editing.

—Annina Periam Danton.

Deutsche Studien — Vorträge und Ansprachen. Von Prof. Dr. Fritz Behrend. Verlag Hermann Wendt G. m. b. H., Berlin SW 68. 132 S. Gebunden RM 3.50, Auslandspreis RM 2.63.

Dieser Sammelband von wissenschaftlichen Überraschungen angenehmster Art stammt von dem weiten Germanistenkreisen bekannten ehemaligen Herausgeber der „Jahresberichte f. Germ. Philologie“ und der „Jahresberichte über wissenschaftl. Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiet der neueren dt. Literatur.“ Zudem hat der Verfasser über ein Vierteljahrhundert das Handschriftenarchiv der Preuss. Akademie verwaltet und dadurch manchen tieferen Einblick in verborgene Zusammenhänge der Literaturgeschichte gewonnen. Das beweist gleich der erste Aufsatz, der den Anteil der Geschichtsforschung an der germanistischen Disziplin bespricht. War die frühere Wertung von Dichtungen als Zeugnisse germanischen Altertums oft falsch, so haben sich im Verlauf des 19. Jhs. freundnachbarlichere Beziehungen herausgebildet. In dem Vortrag „Die deutsche Literatur im Elsass“ schreitet eine ganze tausendjährige Entwicklung an uns vorbei, von Otfried bis auf Friedrich Lienhard und René Schickele. Man ist erstaunt über den Reichtum an Dichtung in diesem alemannischen Teilgebiet, auch über die Einheitlichkeit der Entwicklung trotz schicksalsschwerer Politik. Es tut gut, die Literatur wieder einmal von dieser Warte zu überblicken. Der Habilitationsvortrag bei der Techn. Hochschule Charlottenburg ist betitelt „Trajano Boccalini und die deutsche Literatur,“ geht aber in seiner Tragweite über den Titel hinaus. Behrend entwirft erst ein Bild von dem Leben und Wirken des italienischen Staatsmanns und politischen Schriftstellers (1556-1613), eines schwachen Nachahmers von Machiavelli, wenn auch anders geartet. Die starke Auswirkung auf Deutschland lassen schon die zahlreichen Übertragungen vermuten. Die ironische Haltung Boccalinis beeinflußt Joh. Valentin Andreae. Noch größer ist die Einwirkung auf Balthasar Schupp, die sich in zahlreichen Entlehnungen und häufigen Nachahmungen ausdrückt.

Der kurze Aufsatz über Opitz bricht wie einst Gundolfs Abhandlung eine Lanze für eine gerechtere Würdigung des Reformers. „Keine schöpferische Natur, aber ungewöhnlich klaren Auges erkannte er, was Deutschland kulturell gerade damals Not tat. . . . So gebunden oft sein Leben erscheint, im Ganzen gesehen, ist er doch einer der ersten Dichter unter uns, dem Dichten das Hauptwerk seines Daseins, nicht Ertrag müßiger Nebenstunden ward. . . . Er ist durchaus mehr als ein kluger Opportunist. . . . Ein Persönlichkeitszauber muß ihm zu eigen gewesen sein, sonst läßt es sich nicht verstehen, daß er Bewunderer in allen Lagern fand.“ In einer anmutigen Plauderei wird uns der faszinierende Sonderling Gregor von Meusebach (1781-1847) vorgeführt, jener Jurist, der im Nebenberuf ein autodidaktischer aber ganz namhafter Germanist war, Kenner des 16. und 17. Jhs. wie wenige seiner Zeit und Bahnbrecher der Fischart-Forschung, Freund Schenkendorfs, Wilhelm Müllers, der Brüder Grimm, Lachmanns und Moritz Haupts. In dem Aufsatz „Theodor Storm und seine Heimat,“ einem Höhepunkt der Sammlung, erweist sich Behrend wieder als feiner Kenner des deutschen Realismus. Er verrät warmes Einfühlen in die Welt des Dichters. Ausgehend von der Sagenjagd Storms und Theodor Mommsens im Schleswig-

Holsteinischen, zeigt der Verfasser, wie der Dichter das alte Volksgut für seine eigene Dichtung verwertet, indem er Sagen und Märchen einfach erzählt oder auf sie anspielt, oder sie wie im „Schimmelreiter“ zum „Kristallisierungspunkt“, zur „Keimzelle“ der ganzen Dichtung macht. Stilistisch ward Storm „vom Romantiker zum Realisten.“ Ein kurzer Beitrag beleuchtet die stark deutschen Anfänge der polnischen Universität Krakau (gegr. 1364) unter Kasimir dem Großen und seinem Nachfolger Jagiello. Ein mitgeteilter Brief von Georg Frhr. von Ompteda aus dem Jahre 1905, in dem er sich ablehnend über den Wert von literarischen Preisausschreiben — es handelte sich um eine dichterische Behandlung des Hereroaufstandes — ausspricht, und ein lebendiger Bericht über Eindrücke auf einer Handschriftenreise durch die alten Städte Hollands und Belgiens beschließen das Buch. Das Ganze ist ein Zeugnis gediegener und vielseitiger Gelehrsamkeit in gefälliger Darstellung.

Haverford College.

—Harry W. Pfund.

Reise und Verkehr in Deutschland, Karl Reuning, 64 pp.; **Goethe**, Wilhelm R. Gaede, 63 pp.; **Die deutsche Jugendbewegung**, Wilhelm Hubben, 64 pp. Of the series: "Germany Past and Present," The Cordon Company, New York, 1937. Price 45 cents each.

Under an intriguing comprehensive title, deserving separate attention, the Cordon Company with these three booklets inaugurates a series. Not alone the price is attractive; format, binding, and typography are quite ideal, the little volumes are light and handy, so designed that they will undoubtedly appeal to the student as worth owning. This aim is both commercially and pedagogically sound, and one factor working toward it is the general appearance of the series, reminiscent of the various inexpensive German *Büchereien* and typical of a trend in modern American textbooks away from the familiar dull cover and a thickness betokening a semester of tiresome daily association. These books are uniform in a clever arrangement of ten chapters, four pages each, and thus presumably the right length for a single class hour. Exercises are provided as usual, but these differ from the conventional type; it is immediately sensed that the three author-editor-collaborators, Messrs. Reuning, Gaede and Hubben, who are apparently to be responsible for the remainder of the series, have agreed to outdo one another in concocting Übungen at once stimulating and sound. These consist of one page to a chapter, divided into four types. The paragraphs devoted to Word Study and Idioms are by far the best, while the Questions now and again seem to expect a bit much of the elementary student, failing perhaps by their occasional breadth to start him toward an answer.

The usefulness of footnotes might be increased in future issues, even at the cost of uniformity with those already published, by indicating in the text wherever a footnote occurs; this need not be done with a number, an asterisk or degree-sign (as, for instance, in Prof. Danton's edition of Hausmann: *Abel mit der Mundharmonika*, Gateway Books 1937) would suffice to remind the student that help awaits him.

The vocabularies, although based on the Morgan-Wadepuhl and intentionally omitting the thousand most frequent words (i. e., those starred in the *Minimum Standard German Vocabulary*), occasionally omit others. Casually discovered instances are: *sich einfinden*, *schnüren*, *sich unterstehen*, *zieren* (Gaede); *Stange* (Hubben).

Turning to the booklets individually, Professor Reuning's offers an almost always lively treatment of semi-familiar textbook material. After the first two chapters are done, real interest and excitement are reached in the description of a night on a locomotive (Ch. III), ironic humor in *Das Kursbuch* (Ch. IV), while *Luftverkehr* (Ch. IX), in presenting material about

the now tragic Hindenburg, far from appearing dated, can only have gained in reader-interest. For p. 35, line 1: *neuer*, read: *neue*.

Professor Gaede's brief treatment of Goethe combines the biographical with the appreciative-critical and — in its high-lights — cannot, of course, do full justice to the material. However, it should serve as an introduction awakening the interest of young minds who might otherwise perforce wait until reaching more advanced courses to learn who Goethe was — and is. A printer's error in the earlier copies seems to have been eliminated, the unfortunate mis-naming of the frontispiece, the Stieler-Schreiner portrait, confounding it with the Tischbein, which appears later in the book. These two illustrations add much to external appearances. Readers may differ with passages in the text and even with the choice of quotations; these, however, struck the reviewer as well-chosen. Despite this, the book is not altogether free from confusion for the uninitiated. This holds especially for the treatment of *Faust* — a task of compression, to be sure. Surely nothing has been gained by omitting dates from the brief bibliography. Again, may Goethe be said to have received "eine Berufung an den Hof des Herzogs von Weimar" (p. 17)? One misses from Ch. I any specific mention among formative influences of Graf Thoranc and the quartering of the French in Goethe's father's house, or of the imperial coronation witnessed by Goethe as a boy. These details could not fail to interest American students. In the same way, might not the reference, in the final *Faust* chapter, to Goethe's *Marienettentheater* be both more effective and clearer as well, if this had already been touched on in the first chapter, *Jugend*? The archaic use of *deshalb* in the quotation (p. 12, line 26) calls for a note; *sich in die bürgerliche Berufswelt einordnen* (10, 3) does carry the meaning "adjust, find a place" as in the vocabulary, but not "make a place for himself in the professional world," as in the footnote. (Cf. also 17, 13 and 24, 22.) *Zeitlebens*: "all his life" in the vocabulary does not exactly fit its occurrence on p. 10. *Briefe* (14, 6) requires a following comma to avoid ambiguity, indeed to be consistent. *Altersgrau* (8, 3 and note) is not "hoary" when applied to a city; a person grows white with age, a city greyer and darker. Explanation is in order for 8, 22: *Ein ganzer großer Eindruck*, showing somewhat unusual of *ein*. One cannot help regretting the abbreviation of the refrain in *Heidenröslein* (p. 9), as doing violence to the accepted form and really materially changing the poem as students will read it. The exercises are particularly good.

The third booklet traces the origins of the *Jugendbewegung*, outlines the activities of this and kindred movements, and brings the whole down to the days of the *Hitlerjugend*, which is lightly touched on. There is nothing partisan about the treatment, objectivity being its definite characteristic. One comes to see clearly how far back the roots of the movement go and how eager each of the old political parties and religious groups was to do its best, at least for its own youngsters, even in the now decried days of so-called national degradation.

As to the series title, "Germany Past and Present," nothing is said in the prefaces. Still, it has an encouraging ring, and the projected volumes as announced should bear out one's hope that the goal will be to contemporize, in a sense, our knowledge of Germany, at the same time preserving and popularizing (through such items as the *Goethe*, a Wagner book, and *Humor in der klassischen Literatur*) worthy elements of a highly worthy past.

University of Wisconsin.

—Herman Salinger.

Running somewhat behind these booklets as they make their scheduled appearances, we are able to add a note as we go to press. **Dreißig leichte Lieder** (Gaede) presents a pleasant selection, largely of folksong character, with helpful textual notes for the beginner. Lesser known poets and composers receive no mention; yet, since Goethe, Claudius, Uhland, Heine, Eichendorff and Brahms are singled out, might it not have been worth while in connection with *Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles* to have named Hoffmann von Fallersleben, instead of referring to him anonymously as "the poet", or at least to have told the reader that the music is that of the Austrian hymn by Haydn, a name surely known to the young radio listener?

After a stimulating introductory chapter on *Amerikanischer und Deutscher Humor* suggesting differences without any trace of dogmatism, **Lachende Dichter** (Reuning) offers brief chapters on nine German authors. The best are not necessarily those which would have seemed to afford the readiest material. The last four (Mörike, Keller, Reuter, Busch) are particularly appealing; the Schiller chapter is ingenious. Professor Reuning has realized that humor would be spoilt by anything but a light touch. The quick tempo of his paragraphs atones for an occasional vaguely felt lack of that *weltanschauliche Färbung* foreshadowed by his first chapter.

Die olympischen Spiele (Hubben), as the subtitle *einst und jetzt* indicates, treats this interesting and not as yet overworked subject historically. The first three chapters deal with the ancient games and their decay. Chapters 4 through 10 cover the modern revival with especial reference of course to the last Olympics in Berlin. The material is good reading despite an unavoidable abundance of statistics by no means confined to the end tabulation. Except in the song collection, format and general make-up of text and exercises continue as in the first three numbers of the series.

H. S.

Graded German Reader for Beginners. With Questions and Exercises by Edwin H. Zeydel University of Cincinnati, 1937. F. S. Crofts and Co., New York.

In the Preface the author lays down for himself a number of excellent principles to be observed in the preparation of his *Reader*. He has produced a reader which can be begun very early; he has graded the selections, not only in their vocabulary, but also in grammatical difficulty (p. v). He uses only present tense until Lesson 15, though the pupil may easily have had the imperfect before beginning the *Reader*; in fact, several German grammars defer the introduction of the present tense until after the imperfect is taught. The vocabulary is small and carefully selected, with all the 1018 words of the AATG list not only included, but repeated as often as feasible. All these words are starred in the vocabulary, an excellent idea, and one helpful to both learner and teacher in working especially for an active vocabulary of the greatest possible usefulness.

In Lessons 1-20, all words that might prove difficult of pronunciation are given with accent marks, as they are also in the vocabulary. This is carried so far as to accent such words as *Novem'ber*, *erwähnt'*, etc., which might not be so specifically needed; *auf'geregt'* has two accents. *Urteil* none (p. 11).

The contents are purposely varied and include cultural and historical material, as well as the usual store of anecdotes and *Märchen*. The *Märchen* and the anecdotes are old-timers. Professor Zeydel aims to have some of the historical material of the sort that answers such questions regarding present-day Germany as the intelligent inquirer would be likely to ask. Now and then there is a certain wholesome repetition, as when a letter (p. 89) gives some information regarding German geography and the pres-

ent constituency of the German state that has previously occurred in sections on *Deutsche Flüsse* (pp. 8 f.) and *Etwas über Deutschland* (pp. 4 f.). All the different types of material are scattered, a good idea in this type of book as a means of keeping the pupil's interest alive. Another good idea is seen in the aphorisms, short quotations and poems from a great variety of German authors. Professor Zeydel voices the accepted opinion of Heine's greatness as a lyric poet rather than follow the trend of such critics as Bartels (p. 73). The idea of giving German translations from Shakespeare, Longfellow, etc., has its justification in the fact that all the passages are extremely familiar ones, and that these instances may thus serve as added stimulus to the pupil's imagination, and anything that may make him think in comparative terms is good.

Roman type is used in the first five Lessons, as induction into the reading of German. The style is purposely simple, but excessive simplicity may lead to such a mirth-provoking sentence as: "Eine Frau hatte drei Söhne aber keinen Mann." (p. 42; *Witwe* is in the Vocabulary).

The *Übungen* and *Fragen* are not too numerous, and along with the Model Test—an original item—should be of assistance in preparation and in review.

The copy reading has been careful. On page 64, line 8, *eine kleine Freunde* should be *eine kleine Freude*; p. 113, the plural of *Blume* should be *Blumen*.

—George H. Danton.

Hänselbuch. Von Friedrich Rauers. Essener Verlagsanstalt, Essen. 1936; 266 S.

The German verb "hänseln" is usually translated "to tease, to have fun" and not many people know that a second meaning exists, viz.: to initiate or to accept a new member in an organization. As such "hänseln" is derived from "Hansa" or "Hanse", an old Germanic word signifying a group or a union. Friedrich Rauers, Professor of Economic History at the University of Berlin, has investigated the word "hänseln" as to its connections with old customs and has come to the conclusion that old legal concepts are embodied in it, which go back to a status of society before written law became known. When, however, written law swept away old symbolic usages certain practices, which appealed to the comic side of life, remained.

F. Rauers, in a painstaking manner, has collected the customs of by-gone as well as of present days and gives the reader a fine glimpse into the development of group life dealing with old family traditions, aristocratic formalities and peasant uses. Special chapters are devoted to schools and universities, to the tradesmen and the merchants.

The well illustrated and documented book certainly may be called an enrichment of our knowledge of German "Volkskunde".

University of Wisconsin.

—Herman Barnstorff.

An Introduction to College German by M. C. Cowden and A. van Berden, D. C. Heath and Company, 1937, xxii + 181 pp.

Of the making of German grammars there is no end. But M. C. Cowden and A. van Berden have made a significant contribution in "An Introduction to College German." Just as its name asserts this is an introduction, freed from unessential impedimenta. It is greatly to the credit of the authors that they consider their subject matter of sufficient merit to stand alone without bolstering up by pictures, which—however beautiful—add nothing to our knowledge of grammar.

As it is the authors' purpose to prepare the student quickly for reading, they have streamlined their presentation down to the explanation of gram-

matical principles and exercises on them. This purpose is also reflected in the vocabulary which is divided between 600 words to be learned for use from English into German and 1000 words for recognition from German. However, for those who wish to give reading practice, a series of passages graded to the lessons from the fourth on, is included as a supplement.

The treatment of grammar seems unusually clear, concise and free from freakish statements. But there are two points one could wish to see changed: First, the term "double infinitive" is used to explain the form of the modals used with a complimentary infinitive in the compound tenses. There is plenty of precedent for this terminology, but it simplifies the explanation of the form very greatly, if it is considered as an old strong past participle, which has lost (or never acquired) the *ge-* prefix.

A departure from strict usage of terminology also occurs in the explanation of the inflection of descriptive adjectives. The authors say: "Note particularly the *three CASES** in which limiting adjectives of the *kein* type have no inflectional endings." The use of the word *instances* or *forms* here would have covered the situation without confusing the student, for two instances fall in one case, and never are all the forms of any one case affected by the peculiarity of the "kein" words.

The book concludes with a twelve page appendix recapitulating the inflectional forms of nouns and verbs and giving a rather extensive survey of the meanings of the inseparable prefixes.

The Pennsylvania State College

—Howard E. Yarnall.

IN THE FEBRUARY ISSUE OF THE MONATSHEFTE:

Prof. A. R. Hohlfeld: Rückblicke und Ausblicke.

Prof. C. H. Bell: Toller's "Die Maschinenstürmer."

Prof. Heinrich Henel: Faust Translation and Faust Mosaics — a

Reply.

Dr. Harold Kirshner: Some German Contributions to English Scientific Terminology.

Textbooks:

BOOKS RECEIVED — 1937

Betz, Frederick: Erich Kästner's "Pünktchen und Anton." D. C. Heath & Co. 1937. 128 pp.

Braasch, Theodor and Ten Hoor, G. J.: Jeremias Gotthelf's "Bilder aus der Schweiz," zwei Erzählungen. F. S. Crofts & Co. 1937. 133 pp. \$1.00

Bradley, F. B. and L. R.: Langewiesche's "Das Amerikanische Abenteuer: Deutscher Werkstudent in U. S. A." Prentice-Hall Inc. 1937. 230 pp. \$1.45

Busse A. and Keil, G.: Goethe's "Hermann und Dorothea." D. C. Heath & Co. 1937. 178 pp.

Buxbaum, Ingrid: "Lustiges Alltagsdeutsch." München 1937. 90 pp.

Cochran, E. E.: A Practical German Review Grammar. Prentice-Hall Inc. 1934. 462 pp.

Goldstick, Isidore: Alexander Wilhelm's "Einer muß heiraten," Lustspiel in einem Aufzug. The Copp Clark Co. Ltd. Toronto 1936. 123 pp.

Hagboldt, Peter and Kaufmann, F. W.: A Brief Course in German. D. C. Heath & Co. 1937. 118 pp.

*Cap italics are mine.

Haller, R. W.: Hans Arnold's "Fritz auf Ferien." D. C. Heath & Co. 1937. 87 pp.

Handschin, C. H.: Basic Vocabulary Mastery Series, Part I. For Use at the Elementary Level in Schools and Colleges. D. C. Heath & Co. 1935. 27 pp.

Hewitt, T. B.: Idiomatic German Composition. Oxford University Press, New York 1937. 134 pp. \$1.00

House, R. T. and Marthauer, J.: Leo Slezak's "Meine sämtlichen Werke." Henry Holt & Co. 1937. 138 pp. \$0.96

Howe, G. M.: Elementary German. Harper & Brothers 1937. 164 pp. \$1.20

Hubben, Wilhelm, in collaboration with Gaede, W. R. and Reuning, Karl: Die deutsche Jugendbewegung (no. 50 of the series, "Germany Past and Present"). The Cordon Co. 1937. 64 pp. \$0.45

Jordan, Emil L.: Deutsche Kulturgeschichte im Abriss. F. S. Crofts & Co. 1937. 195 pp. \$1.50

Koch, Ernst: Dauer im Wechsel, An Expository Prose Reader. Prentice-Hall Inc. 1937. 125 pp. \$1.25

Koischwitz, Otto: Reise in die Literatur. J. Lippincott Co. 1937. 196 pp. \$1.35

Koischwitz, Otto and Geyer, Hugh: A German Work Book. F. S. Crofts & Co. 1934. 123 pp.

Leopold, W. F. and Goedsche, C. R.: Lessing's "Minna von Barnhelm." D. C. Heath & Co. 1937. 273 pp.

Lindahl, L. E. J.: An Introduction to German. Farrar & Rinehart Inc. 1936. 300 pp.

Maxwell, W. C.: Deutsch in drei Akten. Harper & Brothers 1937. 203 pp. \$1.40

McLellan, F. R. H.: Ernst Keller's "Der Weg ins Leben." (The Cambridge Contact Readers) Cambridge University Press 1937. 94 pp. \$0.45

McLellan, F. R. H.: Des Deutschen Vaterland II. (The Cambridge Contact Readers). Cambridge University Press 1937. 79 pp. \$0.45

Osborn, E. K.: Des Deutschen Vaterland I. (The Cambridge Contact Readers) Cambridge University Press 1937. 79 pp. \$0.45

Osborn, E. K.: George F. Timpson's "Im Frieden und im Krieg." (The Cambridge Contact Readers) Cambridge University Press 1937. 93 pp. \$0.45

Peebles, W. C.: Thomas Mann's "Mario und der Zauberer." Harper & Brothers 1937. 144 pp. \$1.00

Priest, G. M.: Sudermann's "Fritzchen," Drama in One Act. F. S. Crofts & Co. 1936. 81 pp. \$0.85

Purin, C. M.: A Standard German Vocabulary of 2932 Words and 1500 Idioms. D. C. Heath & Co. 1937. 186 pp.

Schaffrath, William: Alte Jugend-Freunde. Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1935. 356 pp. \$1.50

Schnöckelborg, Georg: Paul Ernst's "Förster und Wilddieb." (The Cambridge Contact Readers) Cambridge University Press 1936. 70 pp. \$0.45

Schnöckelborg, Georg: Werner Jansen's "Herr Reinecke Fuchs." (The Cambridge Contact Readers) Cambridge University Press 1936. 94 pp. \$0.45

Seydewitz, Baroness: Martin Luther: Ein Lebensbild. (The Cambridge Contact Readers) Cambridge University Press 1936. 94 pp. \$0.45

Seydewitz, Baroness: Bismarck: Ein Lebensbild (The Cambridge Contact Readers) Cambridge University Press 1937. 80 pp. \$0.45

Shapiro, H.: Italiander's "Gebrüder Lenz auf Tippfahrt." Oxford University Press 1937. 64 pp. \$0.30

Silz, Walter: German Romantic Lyrics. Harvard University Press 1934. 319 pp. \$1.75

Spann, Meno: First Interlinear German Reader. University of North Carolina Press 1937. 75 pp.

Staubach, C. N.: How to Study Languages. D. C. Heath & Co. 1937. 23 pp.

Stroebe, Lilian L.: Reading Comprehension Tests in German. Henry Holt & Co. 1937. 58 pp. \$0.35

Stroebe, Lilian L. and Klett, Ada M.: Ludwig Fulda's "Höhensonne," Lustspiel in drei Akten. D. Appleton-Century Co. 1937. 156 pp. \$1.20.

Whitaker, Paul K.: Gerstäcker's "Germelshausen" (Heath's Visible Vocabulary German Series). D. C. Heath & Co. 1937. 46 pp.

White, Emilie M.: Ein Ausflug in die deutsche Sprache: Anfangsschritte. Doubleday, Doran Inc. 1937. 247 pp. \$1.60

White, Emilie M.: Ein Ausflug in die deutsche Sprache: Fortschritte. Doubleday, Doran, Inc. 1937. 276 pp. \$1.60

Wild, J. H.: An Introduction to Scientific German. Oxford University Press 1937. 124 pp. \$1.50

Wild, J. H.: An Anthology of Scientific German. Oxford University Press 1937. 300 pp. \$1.95

Wir Lesen Deutsch. Ein Lesebuch. 2-5 Aufl. hsg. Goethe Institut der deutschen Akademie. R. Oldenbourg, Berlin. 207 pp.

Zeydel, Edwin H.: Graded German Reader for Beginners. F. S. Crofts & Co. 1937. 153 pp. \$1.00

Miscellaneous:

Bauer, Franz: Das Tickende Teufelsherz, eine Erzählung für Jungen und Mädel um Peter Henlein, den Erfinder der Taschenuhr. D. Gundert Verlag, Stuttgart 1936. 118 pages. R. M. 1,90

Bussmann, Hans B.: Hundert Meister der deutschen Sprache, Eine Sammlung großer deutscher Prosa. Langenscheidtsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Berlin. 526 pp. R. M. 4,80

Dallmann, William P.: The Spirit of America as Interpreted in the Works of Charles Sealsfield. Diss. Washington University 1935.

Doyle, Henry G.: George Ticknor, together with Ticknor's "Lecture on the Best Methods of Teaching the Living Languages". Washington, D. C. 1937. 37 pp. \$0.50

Drach, Erich: Grundgedanken der deutschen Satzlehre. Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, Frankfurt am Main 1937. 99 pp.

Easum, C. V.: Karl Schurz: Vom deutschen Einwanderer zum amerikanischen Staatsmann. Böhlaus Nachf. Weimar 1937. R. M. 5,50

Eckhardt, Walter: Abriss der deutschen Geschichte von 1648 bis 1792. (Neugestaltung von Recht und Wirtschaft, hrsg. von C. Schaeffer, Bd. 33^o). Leipzig 1937.

Hoefert, F. K.: des Herrn Cantor Johann Kuhnau biblische Klaviersonate: Der Streit zwischen David und Goliath. Verlagsbuchhandlung J. J. Weber, Leipzig 1937. 46 pp. R. M. 0,90

Hoffmeister, Johannes: Hegels Nürnberger Schriften 1808-1816. F. Meiner Verlag, Leipzig 1937. 499 pp. R. M. 12,50

Hoffmeister, Johannes: Hegels Phänomenologie des Geistes. F. Meiner, Leipzig 1937. 598 pp. R. M. 9,80

von Klenze, Camillo: Charles Timothy Brooks, Translator from the German and the Genteel Tradition. Published by The Modern Language Association of America. Boston, D. C. Heath & Co. London, Oxford University Press, 1937.

Milch, Werner: *Die Einsamkeit, Zimmermann und Obereit im Kampf um die Überwindung der Aufklärung*. Verlag Huber & Co., Leipzig. 265 pp.

Pascal, R.: *Shakespeare in Germany, 1740-1815*. Cambridge University Press, 1937. 199 pp. \$2.50

Price, L. M.: *Inkle and Yarico Album*. University of California Press, 1937. 171 pp. \$2.50

Sauer, Kurt: *Deutsche Triumphzüge*. Verlagsbuchhandlung J. J. Weber, Leipzig 1936. 64 pp. R. M. 0,90

Scheibe, Wolfgang: *Aufgabe und Aufbau des Reichsarbeitsdienstes*. (Neugestaltung von Recht und Wirtschaft, hsg. von C. Schaeffer, Heft 35). Leipzig 1938. 48 pp. R. M. 1,00

Schultz, Paul: *Julius Caesar*, by William Shakespeare, with Introduction and Notes. (Aschendorffs Moderne Auslandsbücherei). Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster i. Westphalen 1936. 87 pp. R. M. 0,79

Tharp, James B.: Robert D. Cole's "Modern Foreign Languages and their Teaching"; revised and enlarged. D. Appleton-Century Co. Inc. 1937. 640 pp.

von Wolzogen, Hans: *Allerletzte Lieder aus siebzig Jahren*. Deutscher Volksverlag, München. 111 pp. R. M. 3,00

Other Books Published in 1937

American Book Company — Hildenbrandt: "Der Sand läuft falsch im Stundenglas." Edited by Frederick Betz, pp. viii + 144 pp. \$1.30

Dodge and Viereck: *Etwas Neues*. \$1.30

Ernst: "Das Spukhaus in Litauen." \$1.20

Presher: "Geschichten um Bübchen." \$1.20

F. S. Crofts and Co. — Ernst, Paul: "Jane F. Goodloe." \$1.35

Koischwitz, Otto: *Die Bilderfibel*. \$1.00

Harper and Brothers — Morton Collins Stewart: *Graphic Review of German Grammar*. 199 pp. \$1.40

Henry Holt and Co. — Eltzner, Dorothea: *Aus der deutschen Geschichte*. 224 pp., Illustrated, \$1.44

Heyse: "Das Glück von Rothenburg." Edited by Henry S. King. 135 pp. \$0.96.

Zwölf Dichter der Gegenwart. Edited by Margaret Jeffrey and Johanna Volbehr, 75 pp. \$1.10

Mattheus: "Robby kämpft um seine Freiheit." Edited by Lilian L. Stroebe and Ruth J. Hofrichter, 92 pp., Illustrated, \$0.96

J. B. Lippincott Co. — Neuse, Werner: *Wege zur deutschen Kultur*. Edited by Otto Koischwitz, 252 pp. \$1.50

The Macmillan Co. — Nock, F. J.: *An Introduction to Scientific German*, 148 pp. \$1.25

Oxford University Press — Malkowsky: "Peter Krafft, Der Segelflieger." Edited by I. Finn, 64 pp. with vocabulary. \$0.30.

Strong: "Der Große Unbekannte." Edited by A. S. Barratt, 64 pp. with vocabulary. \$0.30

Prentice-Hall, Inc. — Handschin, Charles H.: *Introduction to German Civilization*, 235 pp. \$1.25

Deutsches Lesebuch, A Literary and Cultural Reader. Edited by Frederick S. Sethur, 26 pp., Illustrated. \$1.60

"The outstanding general journal of modern foreign language teaching"—that is why nearly 3000 teachers of German, French, Spanish or Italian in schools and colleges, and more than 1000 school, college and public libraries, subscribe for . . .

THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

Published by the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers

8 issues a year, October to May, inclusive

(Publication date, the 15th of months named)

Up-to-date and authoritative material on methods, materials, research, publications, and textbooks in the field

\$2.00 a year; foreign countries, including Canada, \$2.50, payable in advance
Sample copy on request

THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

GEORGE W. H. SHIELD, Business Manager

1537 West 46th Street

Los Angeles, Calif.

"Every Teacher of German, French, Spanish or Italian Needs
The Modern Language Journal"

"VOCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDENTS," by Schwartz, Wilkins, and Bovee, a report issued under the auspices of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers, is a frank and honest answer to the vocational phase of the question. "What is the practical value of modern foreign language study?" Obtainable from the office of the Journal. Price, 25 cents postpaid, payable in advance.

You are cordially invited to join the

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF GERMAN

and to subscribe to

The GERMAN QUARTERLY

Published by the Association in January,
March, May and November

The dues for membership are \$2.50 a year; this includes the GERMAN QUARTERLY.

The subscription price for the GERMAN QUARTERLY alone is \$2.00 a year, single copies 50c; sample copies on request.

Please address all business communications to

GUNTHER KEIL
BUSINESS MANAGER
Hunter College, Kingsbridge Station
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Die Märznummer der Monatshefte — eine Doppelnummer — ist dem Altmeister der Germanistik, Professor Dr. A. R. Hohlfeld, gewidmet, der sich am Ende dieses Semesters von seiner Lehrtätigkeit an der Universität von Wisconsin zurückzieht. Beiträge zu dieser Hohlfeld-Nummer sind eingegangen von:

Prof. Dr. Aron, University of Illinois; Prof. Dr. Bruns, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Dr. Busse, Hunter College; Prof. Dr. Evans, Ohio State University; Prof. Dr. Feise, The Johns Hopkins University; Prof. Dr. von Grueningen, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Dr. Hollander, University of Texas; Prof. Dr. Morgan, Stanford University; Prof. Dr. Price, University of California; Prof. Dr. Purin, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Dr. Rehder, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Dr. Roedder, City College of New York; Dean Sellery, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Dr. Senn, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Dr. Twaddell, University of Wisconsin; u. a.

— Die Schriftleitung.